arXiv:1612.09040v1 [math.CA] 29 Dec 2016

SPECTRAL GAPS WITHOUT THE PRESSURE CONDITION

JEAN BOURGAIN AND SEMYON DYATLOV

Abstract. For all convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces, we prove the existence of an essential spectral gap, that is a strip beyond the unitarity axis in which the Selberg zeta function has only finitely many zeroes. We make no assumption on the dimension δ of the limit set, in particular we do not require the pressure condition $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$. This is the first result of this kind for quantum Hamiltonians.

Our proof follows the strategy developed in Dyatlov–Zahl [DZ16]. The main new ingredient is the fractal uncertainty principle for δ-regular sets with $\delta < 1$, which may be of independent interest.

Let $M = \Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^2$ be a (noncompact) convex co-compact hyperbolic surface. The Selberg zeta function $Z_M(s)$ is a product over the set $\mathcal{L}_M$ of all primitive closed geodesics

$$Z_M(s) = \prod_{\ell\in\mathcal{L}_M}\prod_{k=0}^{\infty}\big(1-e^{-(s+k)\ell}\big), \quad \operatorname{Re} s \gg 1,$$

and extends meromorphically to $s\in\mathbb{C}$. From the spectral description of Z_M it is known that $Z_M(s)$ has only finitely many zeroes in $\{\operatorname{Re} s > \frac{1}{2}\}$, which correspond to small eigenvalues of the Laplacian. The situation in $\{\operatorname{Re} s \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$ is more complicated since the zeroes of Z_M are no longer given by a self-adjoint spectral problem on $L^2(M)$; they instead correspond to scattering resonances of M and are related to decay of waves.

A natural question is if M has an *essential spectral gap*, that is does there exist $\beta > 0$ such that $Z_M(s)$ has only finitely many zeroes in $\{\operatorname{Re} s > \frac{1}{2} - \beta\}$? The known answers so far depend on the exponent of convergence of the Poincaré series of the group, denoted $\delta\in[0,1)$. Patterson [Pa76] and Sullivan [Su79] proved that there is a gap of size $\beta = \frac{1}{2}-\delta$ when $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ and Naud [Na05] showed there is a gap of size $\beta > \frac{1}{2}-\delta$ when $0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$. The present paper removes the restrictions on δ:

Theorem 1. *Every convex co-compact hyperbolic surface has an essential spectral gap.*

Spectral gaps for hyperbolic surfaces have many important applications, such as diophantine problems (see Bourgain–Gamburd–Sarnak [BGS11], Oh–Winter [OW16], Magee–Oh–Winter [MOW14], and the lecture notes by Sarnak [Sa12]) and remainders in the prime geodesic theorem (see for instance the book of Borthwick [Bo16, §14.6]). Moreover, hyperbolic surfaces are a standard model for more general open quantum chaotic systems, where spectral gaps have been studied since the work of Ikawa [Ik88] and Gaspard–Rice [GR89] – see §1.1 below.

Theorem 1 can also be viewed in terms of the scattering resolvent

$$R(\lambda)=\Big(-\Delta_M-\frac14-\lambda^2\Big)^{-1}:\begin{cases}L^2(M)\to H^2(M), & \operatorname{Im}\lambda>0;\\ L^2_{\mathrm{comp}}(M)\to H^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(M), & \lambda\in\mathbb{C}.\end{cases}$$

where $\Delta_M\le 0$ is the Laplace–Beltrami operator of M. The family $R(\lambda)$ is meromorphic and its poles, called *resonances*, correspond to the zeroes of $Z_M(s)$, $s:=\frac12-i\lambda$; see for instance [Bo16, Chapter 10]. Therefore, Theorem 1 says that there are only finitely many resonances with $\operatorname{Im}\lambda>-\beta$. Since our proof uses [DZ16] and a fractal uncertainty principle (Theorem 3), we obtain a polynomial resolvent bound:

Theorem 2. *Let M be as in Theorem 1 and take $\beta=\beta(M)>0$ given by Theorem 3 below. Then for each $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $C_0>0$ such that for all $\varphi\in C^\infty_0(M)$*

$$\|\varphi R(\lambda)\varphi\|_{L^2\to L^2}\le C|\lambda|^{-1-2\min(0,\operatorname{Im}\lambda)+\varepsilon},\quad |\lambda|>C_0,\ \operatorname{Im}\lambda\in[-\beta+\varepsilon,1] \tag{1.1}$$

where the constant C depends on ε,φ, but not on λ.

Remarks. 1. We see from Theorem 2 that there is an essential spectral gap of size β for all $\beta<\beta(M)$ where $\beta(M)$ is given by Theorem 3, but not necessarily for $\beta=\beta(M)$. However, this is irrelevant since Theorem 3 does not specify the value of $\beta(M)$.

2. Spectral gaps for convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces were studied numerically by Borthwick [Bo14] and Borthwick–Weich [BW16], see also [Bo16, §16.3.2].

1.1. **Systems with hyperbolic trapping.** The case of convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces studied here belongs to the more general class of *open systems with uniformly hyperbolic trapped sets which have fractal structure* – see the reviews of Nonnenmacher [No11] and Zworski [Zw16] for the definition of these systems and an overview of the history of the spectral gap problem. Another example of such systems is given by scattering in the exterior of several convex obstacles under the no-eclipse condition, where spectral gaps were observed experimentally by Barkhofen et al. [BWPSKZ13].

For general hyperbolic systems, resolvent bounds of type (1.1) have important applications to dispersive partial differential equations, including (the list of references below is by no means extensive)

- exponential local energy decay $\mathcal{O}(e^{-\beta t})$ of linear waves modulo a finite dimensional space corresponding to resonances with $\operatorname{Im}\lambda>-\beta$, see Christianson [Ch09] and Guillarmou–Naud [GN09];
- exponential stability for nonlinear wave equations, see Hintz–Vasy [HV16];
- local smoothing estimates, see Datchev [Da09];
- Strichartz estimates, see Burq–Guillarmou–Hassell [BGH10].

Theorem 2 is the first unconditional spectral gap result for quantum chaotic Hamiltonians with fractal hyperbolic trapped sets. It is a step towards the following general spectral gap conjecture:

Conjecture. [Zw16, §3.2, Conjecture 3] *Suppose that P is an operator for which the scattering resolvent admits a meromorphic continuation (e.g. $P = -\Delta_M$ where (M, g) is a complete Riemannian manifold with Euclidean or asymptotically hyperbolic infinite ends). Assume that the underlying classical flow (e.g. the geodesic flow on (M, g)) has a compact hyperbolic trapped set.*

Then there exists $\beta > 0$ such that (M, g) has an essential spectral gap of size β, that is the scattering resolvent has only finitely many poles with $\operatorname{Im}\lambda > -\beta$.

We give a brief overview of some of the previous works related to this conjecture:

- A spectral gap of size $\beta = -P(\frac{1}{2})$ under the *pressure condition* $P(\frac{1}{2}) < 0$ was proved for obstacle scattering by Ikawa [Ik88], postulated in the physics literature by Gaspard–Rice [GR89], and proved for general hyperbolic trapped sets by Nonnenmacher–Zworski [NZ09a, NZ09b]. Here $P(\sigma)$ is the *topological pressure* of the system, see for instance [No11, (14)] or [Zw16, (3.28)]. For the case of hyperbolic surfaces considered here, we have $P(\sigma) = \delta - \sigma$, so the pressure condition is $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ and the pressure gap is the Patterson–Sullivan gap.
- An improved spectral gap $\beta > -P(\frac{1}{2})$ under the relaxed pressure condition $P(\frac{1}{2}) \leq 0$ was proved by Naud [Na05] for convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces, Stoyanov [St11] for more general cases of Ruelle zeta functions including higher-dimensional convex co-compact hyperbolic manifolds, and Petkov–Stoyanov [PS10] for obstacle scattering. The above papers rely on the method originally developed by Dolgopyat [Do98].
- Jakobson–Naud [JN12] conjectured a gap of size $-\frac{1}{2}P(1) = \frac{1-\delta}{2}$ for hyperbolic surfaces and obtained upper bounds on the size of the gap.
- Dyatlov–Zahl [DZ16] reduced the spectral gap question for convex co-compact hyperbolic manifolds to a *fractal uncertainty principle* (see §1.2 below) and showed an improved gap $\beta > -P(\frac{1}{2})$ for surfaces with $P(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$ and for nearby surfaces. The size of the gap was estimated in terms of the regularity constant C_R (defined in §1.3 below) using methods from additive combinatorics. Dyatlov–Jin [DJ17] adapt the methods of [Do98, Na05] to obtain an improved gap for $P(\frac{1}{2}) \leq 0$ which depends polynomially on C_R.
- In a related setting of open quantum baker's maps, Dyatlov–Jin [DJ16] used a fractal uncertainty principle to show that every such system has a gap, and obtained quantitative bounds on the size of the gap.

1.2. **Uncertainty principle for hyperbolic limit sets.** The proof of Theorem 1 uses the strategy of [DZ16], which reduced the spectral gap question to a fractal uncertainty principle. To state it, define the operator $\mathcal{B}_\chi = \mathcal{B}_\chi(h)$ on $L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$ by

$$\mathcal{B}_\chi f(y) = (2\pi h)^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{S}^1} |y-y'|^{2i/h} \chi(y,y') f(y')\, dy' \tag{1.2}$$

where $|y-y'|$ denotes the Euclidean distance on $\mathbb{R}^2$ restricted to the unit circle $\mathbb{S}^1$ and

$$\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1_\Delta), \quad \mathbb{S}^1_\Delta := \{(y,y') \in \mathbb{S}^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1 \mid y \neq y'\}.$$

The semiclassical parameter $h > 0$ corresponds to the inverse of the frequency and also to the inverse of the spectral parameter: $h \sim |\lambda|^{-1}$. We will be interested in the limit $h \to 0$. The operator $\mathcal{B}_\chi$ is bounded on $L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)$ uniformly in h, see [DZ16, §5.1]. We can $\mathcal{B}_\chi$ it as a hyperbolic analogue of the (semiclassically rescaled) Fourier transform.

A key object associated to the surface M is the *limit set* $\Lambda_\Gamma \subset \mathbb{S}^1$; see for instance [Bo16, §2.2.1] or [DZ16, (4.11)] for the definition. Theorems 1 and 2 follow by combining [DZ16, Theorem 3] with the following uncertainty principle for Λ_Γ:

Theorem 3. *Let $M = \Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^2$ be a convex co-compact hyperbolic surface and denote by $\Lambda_\Gamma(h^\rho) \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ the h^ρ-neighborhood of the limit set. Then there exist $\beta > 0$ and $\rho \in (0,1)$ depending only on M such that for all $\chi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1_\Delta)$ and $h \in (0,1)$*

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{\Lambda_\Gamma(h^\rho)} \mathcal{B}_\chi(h) \mathbb{1}_{\Lambda_\Gamma(h^\rho)} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)\to L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)} \leq C h^\beta \tag{1.3}$$

where the constant C depends on M, χ, but not on h.

Remarks. 1. We call (1.3) an uncertainty principle because it implies that no quantum state can be localized h^ρ close to $\Gamma_\pm \subset S^*M$, where S^*M denotes the cosphere bundle of M and $\Gamma_\pm$ are the incoming/outgoing tails, consisting of geodesics trapped in the future (Γ_-) or in the past (Γ_+). The lifts of $\Gamma_\pm$ to $S^*\mathbb{H}^2$ can be expressed in terms of Λ_Γ. See [DZ16, §§1.1, 4.1.2] for details.

2. The value of β depends only on δ and the regularity constant C_R of the set Λ_Γ (see §§1.3,4.3). We were not able to specify the precise dependence of β on δ, C_R, due to the lack of quantitative bounds in the Beurling–Malliavin Multiplier Theorem (see §2.3), however the results of [DJ16] suggest that for $\delta > \frac{1}{2}$, the largest possible value of β should decay like the exponential of some power of C_R. The parameter ρ will be taken very close to 1.

3. If we vary M within the moduli space $\mathscr{M}$ of convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces, then δ changes continuously (in fact, real analytically). As shown in [DZ16, Proposition 7.7] for the special case of three-funnel surfaces, the regularity constant C_R can be bounded locally uniformly on $\mathscr{M}$, and the argument can be adapted to the general case. Therefore the value of β is bounded away from 0 as long as M varies in a compact subset of $\mathscr{M}$.

1.3. **Uncertainty principle for regular fractal sets.** In order to prove Theorem 3 we exploit the fractal structure of the limit set Λ_Γ. For simplicity we make the illegal choice of $\rho := 1$ in the informal explanations below.

The (Hausdorff and Minkowski) dimension of Λ_Γ is equal to $\delta \in [0,1)$, so the volume of $\Lambda_\Gamma(h)$ decays like $h^{1-\delta}$ as $h \to 0$. For $\delta < \frac{1}{2}$ this implies (using the $L^1 \to L^\infty$ estimate on $\mathcal{B}_\chi(h)$ together with Hölder's inequality) the uncertainty principle (1.3) with $\beta = \frac{1}{2} - \delta$ and thus recovers the Patterson–Sullivan gap – see [DZ16, §5.1].

However, for $\delta \geq \frac{1}{2}$ one cannot obtain (1.3) by using only the volume of the set $\Lambda_\Gamma(h)$. Indeed, if we replace $\Lambda_\Gamma(h)$ by an interval of size $h^{1/2}$, then a counterexample to (1.3) is given by a Gaussian. Therefore, one needs to exploit finer fractal structure of the limit set. For us such structure is given by *Ahlfors–David regularity*, which roughly speaking states that Λ_Γ has dimension δ at each point on each scale:

Definition 1.1. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a nonempty closed set and $\delta \in [0,1]$, $C_R \geq 1$, $0 \leq \alpha_0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \infty$. We say that X is δ-**regular with constant** C_R **on scales** α_0 **to** α_1, if there exists a Borel measure μ_X on $\mathbb{R}$ such that:*

- *μ_X is supported on X, that is $\mu_X(\mathbb{R} \setminus X) = 0$;*
- *for each interval I of size $|I| \in [\alpha_0, \alpha_1]$, we have $\mu_X(I) \leq C_R |I|^\delta$;*
- *if additionally I is centered at a point in X, then $\mu_X(I) \geq C_R^{-1} |I|^\delta$.*

Remarks. 1. The condition that μ_X is supported on X is never used in this paper (and the measure μ_X is referred to explicitly only in §2.2), however we keep it to make the definition compatible with [DJ17].

2. In estimates regarding regular sets, it will be important that the constants involved may depend on δ, C_R, but not on α_0, α_1. Thus it is useful to think of δ, C_R as fixed and α_1/α_0 as large.

3. As indicated above, the limit set Λ_Γ is δ-regular on scales 0 to 1 where $\delta \in [0,1)$ is the exponent of convergence of the Poincaré series of the group Γ – see §4.3.

The key component of the proof of Theorem 3 is the following fractal uncertainty principle for the Fourier transform and general δ-regular sets; it is a result of independent interest. In §4 we show that Theorem 4 implies Theorem 3 by linearizing the phase of the operator (1.2).

Theorem 4. *Let $0 \leq \delta < 1$, $C_R \geq 1$, $N \geq 1$ and assume that*

- *$X \subset [-1,1]$ is δ-regular with constant C_R on scales N^{-1} to 1, and*
- *$Y \subset [-N,N]$ is δ-regular with constant C_R on scales 1 to N.*

Then there exist $\beta > 0, C$ depending only on δ, C_R such that for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$

$$\operatorname{supp} \hat{f} \subset Y \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \|f\|_{L^2(X)} \leq C N^{-\beta} \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}. \tag{1.4}$$

The proof of Theorem 4, given in §3, relies on the following two ideas:

- If $\hat f(\xi)$ decays as $\xi \to \infty$ much faster than $\exp(-|\xi|/\log|\xi|)$, then f cannot vanish on any interval of positive size. We quantify this statement using harmonic measures in strip domains.
- There exist compactly supported functions whose Fourier transforms decay much faster than $\exp(-|\xi|/\log|\xi|)$ on Y. To show this we use the δ-regularity of Y and the Beurling–Malliavin Multiplier Theorem.

Combining these observations, we obtain a quantitative unique continuation principle for functions f which are Fourier supported on Y (Proposition 3.3) which gives a lower bound on the L^2 norm of the restriction of f to a collection of intervals of size ~ 1. To prove Theorem 4 we set up an iteration on scale using a family of weights with compact Fourier supports. At each next step we use coarser information about the Fourier support of f (namely, it being contained in larger and larger neighborhoods of Y) and get lower bounds on restrictions to finer and finer intervals, which are chosen so that they do not lie in the set X (which is made possible by the δ-regularity of X). Each step of the iteration gives a gain of $1-\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$, and after $\sim \log N$ steps we obtain the polynomial improvement $N^{-\beta}$ in (1.4).

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notation.** We first introduce the notation used in the paper.

For two sets $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}$, define $X + Y := \{x + y \mid x \in X,\ y \in Y\}$. For $\lambda \geq 0$, denote $\lambda X := \{\lambda x \mid x \in X\}$. For an interval $I = x_0 + [-r, r] \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $r \geq 0$, denote by $|I| := 2r$ the size of I and say that x_0 is the center of I. For $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha \geq 0$, define the α-neighborhood of X by

$$X(\alpha) := X + [-\alpha, \alpha] \ \subset\ \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.1}$$

For $X \subset \mathbb{R}$, denote by $\mathbf{1}_X \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ the indicator function of X and by $\mathbb{1}_X : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to L^2(\mathbb{R})$ the corresponding multiplication operator. For each $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, denote

$$\langle \xi \rangle := \sqrt{1 + |\xi|^2}.$$

We use the following convention for the Fourier transform of $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$:

$$\hat f(\xi) = \mathcal{F} f(\xi) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i x\xi} f(x)\, dx. \tag{2.2}$$

One advantage of this convention is that $\mathcal{F}$ extends to a unitary operator on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Recall the Fourier inversion formula

$$f(x) = \mathcal{F}^* \hat f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i x\xi} \hat f(\xi)\, d\xi \tag{2.3}$$

and the convolution formula

$$\widehat{f * g}(\xi) = \hat{f}(\xi) \cdot \hat{g}(\xi). \tag{2.4}$$

For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, define the Sobolev space $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ with the norm

$$\|f\|_{H^s} := \|\langle \xi \rangle^s \hat{f}(\xi)\|_{L^2}. \tag{2.5}$$

We also use the unitary semiclassical Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}_h$ on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_h f(\xi) = h^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-2\pi i x\xi/h} f(x)\, dx = h^{-1/2} \hat{f}\Big(\frac{\xi}{h}\Big), \quad h > 0. \tag{2.6}$$

The following identity holds for all $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}$, $x_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and h, and follows directly from the fact that $\mathcal{F}_h^*$ conjugates shifts to multiplication operators:

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X+x_0} \mathcal{F}_h^* \mathbb{1}_{Y+y_0} \|_{L^2 \to L^2} = \| \mathbb{1}_X \mathcal{F}_h^* \mathbb{1}_Y \|_{L^2 \to L^2}. \tag{2.7}$$

We also note the following corollary of the triangle inequality:

$$X \subset \bigcup_j X_j, \quad Y \subset \bigcup_k Y_k \quad \Rightarrow \quad \| \mathbb{1}_X \mathcal{F}_h^* \mathbb{1}_Y \|_{L^2 \to L^2} \le \sum_{j,k} \| \mathbb{1}_{X_j} \mathcal{F}_h^* \mathbb{1}_{Y_k} \|_{L^2 \to L^2}. \tag{2.8}$$

Finally, we record the following version of Hölder's inequality:

$$\sum_j a_j^\kappa \cdot b_j^{1-\kappa} \le \Big(\sum_j a_j \Big)^\kappa \cdot \Big(\sum_j b_j \Big)^{1-\kappa}, \quad a_j, b_j \ge 0,\ \kappa \in (0,1). \tag{2.9}$$

2.2. **Regular sets.** We now establish properties of δ-regular sets (see Definition 1.1), some of which have previously appeared in [DZ16].

We start by showing that certain operations preserve the class of δ-regular sets if we allow to increase the regularity constant and shrink the scales on which regularity is imposed. The precise dependence of the new regularity constant on the original one, though specified in the lemmas below, is not important for our later proofs.

Lemma 2.1 (Affine transformations)**.** *Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to α_1. Fix $\lambda > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Then the set $\widetilde{X} := y + \lambda X$ is δ-regular with constant C_R on scales $\lambda\alpha_0$ to $\lambda\alpha_1$.*

Proof. This is straightforward to verify, taking the measure

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(A) := \lambda^\delta \mu_X\big(\lambda^{-1}(A - y)\big). \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.2 (Increasing the upper scale)**.** *Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to α_1. Fix $T \ge 1$. Then X is δ-regular with constant $\widetilde{C}_R := 2TC_R$ on scales α_0 to $T\alpha_1$.*

Proof. Let I be an interval such that $\alpha_0 \le |I| \le T\alpha_1$. We first show the upper bound $\mu_X(I) \le \widetilde{C}_R|I|^\delta$. For $\alpha_0 \le |I| \le \alpha_1$ this is immediate, so we may assume that $\alpha_1 < |I| \le T\alpha_1$. Then I can be covered by $\lceil T \rceil \le 2T$ intervals of size α_1 each, therefore

$$\mu_X(I) \ \le \ 2T \cdot C_R\alpha_1^\delta \ \le \ \widetilde{C}_R|I|^\delta.$$

Now, assume that I is centered at a point in X. We show the lower bound $\mu_X(I) \ge \widetilde{C}_R^{-1}|I|^\delta$. As before, we may assume that $\alpha_1 < |I| \le T\alpha_1$. Let $I' \subset I$ be the interval with the same center and $|I'| = \alpha_1$. Then

$$\mu_X(I) \ \ge \ \mu_X(I') \ \ge \ C_R^{-1}\alpha_1^\delta \ \ge \ \widetilde{C}_R^{-1}|I|^\delta. \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.3 (Neighborhoods)**.** *Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to $\alpha_1 \ge 2\alpha_0$. Fix $T \ge 1$. Then the neighborhood $X(T\alpha_0) = X + [-T\alpha_0, T\alpha_0]$ is δ-regular with constant $\widetilde{C}_R := 4TC_R$ on scales $2\alpha_0$ to α_1.*

Proof. Put $\widetilde{X} := X(T\alpha_0)$ and define the measure $\mu_{\widetilde{X}}$ supported on $\widetilde{X}$ by convolution:

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(A) := \frac{1}{T\alpha_0}\int_{-T\alpha_0}^{T\alpha_0} \mu_X(A+y)\,dy.$$

Let I be an interval such that $2\alpha_0 \le |I| \le \alpha_1$. Then

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(I) \ \le \ 2C_R|I|^\delta \ \le \ \widetilde{C}_R|I|^\delta.$$

Now, assume additionally that I is centered at a point $x_1 \in \widetilde{X}$. Take $x_0 \in X$ such that $|x_0 - x_1| \le T\alpha_0$ and let I' be the interval of size $\frac{1}{2}|I|$ centered at x_0. Then $\mu_X(I') \ge (2C_R)^{-1}|I|^\delta$. Let $J = x_0 - x_1 + [-\frac{1}{2}\alpha_0, \frac{1}{2}\alpha_0]$, then $J \cap [-T\alpha_0, T\alpha_0]$ is an interval of size at least $\frac{1}{2}\alpha_0$ and for each $y \in J$, we have $I' \subset I + y$. It follows that

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(I) \ \ge \ \frac{1}{2T}\mu_X(I') \ \ge \ \widetilde{C}_R^{-1}|I|^\delta. \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.4 (Nonlinear transformations)**.** *Assume that $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a C^1 diffeomorphism such that for some constant $C_F \ge 1$*

$$C_F^{-1} \ \le \ |\partial_x F| \ \le \ C_F.$$

Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to $\alpha_1 \ge C_F^2\alpha_0$. Then $F(X)$ is a δ-regular set with constant $\widetilde{C}_R := C_FC_R$ on scales $C_F\alpha_0$ to $C_F^{-1}\alpha_1$.

Proof. Put $\widetilde{X} := F(X)$ and define the measure $\mu_{\widetilde{X}}$ supported on $\widetilde{X}$ as a pullback:

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(A) := \mu_X(F^{-1}(A)).$$

Let $\widetilde{I}$ be an interval with $C_F\alpha_0 \le |\widetilde{I}| \le C_F^{-1}\alpha_1$. Take the interval $I := F^{-1}(\widetilde{I})$. Then

$$C_F^{-1}|\widetilde{I}| \ \le \ |I| \ \le \ C_F|\widetilde{I}|.$$

In particular, $\alpha_0 \le |I| \le \alpha_1$. Therefore,

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(\widetilde{I}) \ = \ \mu_X(I) \ \le \ C_R|I|^\delta \ \le \ \widetilde{C}_R|\widetilde{I}|^\delta.$$

If additionally $\widetilde{I}$ is centered at a point $\tilde{x} \in \widetilde{X}$, then I contains the interval I' of size $C_F^{-1}|\widetilde{I}|$ centered at $F^{-1}(\tilde{x}) \in X$. Therefore,

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(\widetilde{I}) \;\geq\; \mu_X(I') \;\geq\; C_R^{-1}|I'|^\delta \;\geq\; \widetilde{C}_R^{-1}|\widetilde{I}|^\delta. \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.5 (Intersections with intervals)**.** *Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to α_1. Fix two different intervals $J \subset J'$ with the same center and $|J'| - |J| \geq \alpha_0$. Assume that $X \cap J$ is nonempty and $X \cap J' \subset J$. Then $X \cap J$ is δ-regular with constant C_R on scales α_0 to $\tilde{\alpha}_1 := \min(\alpha_1, |J'| - |J|)$.*

Proof. Put $\widetilde{X} := X \cap J = X \cap J'$ and consider the measure $\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(A) := \mu_X(A \cap J')$ supported on $\widetilde{X}$. Let I be an interval with $\alpha_0 \leq |I| \leq \tilde{\alpha}_1$. Then

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(I) \;\leq\; \mu_X(I) \;\leq\; C_R|I|^\delta.$$

Now, assume that I is centered at some $x \in \widetilde{X}$. Then $x \in J$ and thus $I \subset J'$, giving

$$\mu_{\widetilde{X}}(I) \;=\; \mu_X(I) \;\geq\; C_R^{-1}|I|^\delta. \quad \square$$

We now establish further properties of δ-regular sets, starting with a quantitative version of the fact that every δ-regular set with $\delta < 1$ is nowhere dense:

Lemma 2.6 (The missing subinterval property)**.** *Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to α_1, and $0 \leq \delta < 1$. Fix an integer*

$$L \geq (3C_R)^{\frac{2}{1-\delta}}. \tag{2.10}$$

Assume that I is an interval with $\alpha_0 \leq |I|/L < |I| \leq \alpha_1$ and $I_1, \ldots, I_L$ is the partition of I into intervals of size $|I|/L$. Then there exists ℓ such that $X \cap I_\ell = \emptyset$.

Proof. Using Lemma 2.1, we reduce to the case $I = [0, L]$, $\alpha_0 \leq 1 < L \leq \alpha_1$. Then $I_\ell = [\ell - 1, \ell]$. We argue by contradiction, assuming that each I_ℓ intersects X. Then $I'_\ell := [\ell - 3/2, \ell + 1/2]$ contains a size 1 interval centered at a point in X and thus

$$\mu_X(I'_\ell) \geq C_R^{-1} \quad \text{for all } \ell = 1, \ldots, L.$$

On the other hand, $\bigcup_{\ell=1}^L I'_\ell = [-1/2, L + 1/2]$ can be covered by 2 intervals of size L and each point lies in at most 3 of the intervals I'_ℓ. Therefore,

$$C_R^{-1}L \;\leq\; \sum_{\ell=1}^{L} \mu_X(I'_\ell) \;\leq\; 3\mu_X\Big(\bigcup_{\ell=1}^{L} I'_\ell\Big) \;\leq\; 6C_R L^\delta$$

which contradicts (2.10). $\square$

We next obtain the following fact used in §4.1:

Lemma 2.7 (Splitting into smaller regular sets)**.** *Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to α_1 and assume that $0 \le \delta < 1$ and $(4C_R)^{\frac{2}{1-\delta}}\alpha_0 \le \rho \le \alpha_1$. Then there exists a collection of disjoint intervals $\mathcal{J}$ such that*

$$X = \bigsqcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}} (X\cap J); \quad (4C_R)^{-\frac{2}{1-\delta}}\rho \le |J| \le \rho \quad \text{for all } J\in\mathcal{J} \tag{2.11}$$

and each $X\cap J$ is δ-regular with constant $\widetilde{C}_R := (4C_R)^{\frac{2}{1-\delta}}C_R$ on scales α_0 to ρ.

Proof. Fix an integer L satisfying (2.10) and $L \le (4C_R)^{\frac{2}{1-\delta}}$. Consider the intervals

$$I_\ell := \frac{\rho}{L}[\ell, \ell+1], \quad \ell\in\mathbb{Z}.$$

By Lemma 2.6, for each ℓ at least one of the intervals $I_\ell, I_{\ell+1}, \dots, I_{\ell+L-1}$ does not intersect X. Define the collection $\mathcal{J}$ as follows: $J\in\mathcal{J}$ if and only if $J = I_\ell\cup\dots\cup I_r$ for some $\ell \le r$, each of the intervals $I_\ell,\dots,I_r$ intersects X, but $I_{\ell-1}, I_{r+1}$ do not intersect X. Then (2.11) holds.

For each $J = I_\ell\cup\dots\cup I_r\in\mathcal{J}$, take $J' := I_{\ell-1}\cup\dots\cup I_{r+1}$. Then $X\cap J'\subset J$ and $|J'|-|J| = 2\rho/L$. By Lemma 2.5, $X\cap J$ is δ-regular with constant C_R on scales α_0 to $2\rho/L$. Then by Lemma 2.2, $X\cap J$ is δ-regular with constant $\widetilde{C}_R$ on scales α_0 to ρ. □

The following covering statement is used in the proof of Lemma 3.1:

Lemma 2.8 (The small cover property)**.** *Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to α_1. Let I be an interval and $\rho > 0$ satisfy $\alpha_0 \le \rho \le |I| \le \alpha_1$. Then there exists a nonoverlapping collection $\mathcal{J}$ of $N_\mathcal{J}$ intervals of size ρ each such that*

$$X\cap I \ \subset \bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}} J, \quad N_\mathcal{J} \le 12C_R^2\Big(\frac{|I|}{\rho}\Big)^\delta.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{J}$ consist of all intervals of the form $\rho[j, j+1]$, $j\in\mathbb{Z}$ which intersect $X\cap I$. Then $X\cap I\subset\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}} J$. It remains to prove the upper bound on $N_\mathcal{J}$. For this we use an argument similar to the one in Lemma 2.6.

For each $J\in\mathcal{J}$, let $J'\supset J$ be the interval with the same center and $|J'| = 2\rho$. Since J intersects X, J' contains an interval of size ρ centered at a point in X. Therefore,

$$\mu_X(J') \ge C_R^{-1}\rho^\delta.$$

On the other hand, $\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}} J'\subset I(\frac{3}{2}\rho)$ can be covered by 4 intervals of size $|I|$ and each point lies in at most 3 of the intervals J'. Therefore,

$$N_\mathcal{J}\cdot C_R^{-1}\rho^\delta \ \le \ \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}}\mu_X(J') \ \le \ 3\mu_X\Big(\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}} J'\Big) \ \le \ 12C_R|I|^\delta$$

which implies the upper bound on $N_\mathcal{J}$. □

Lemma 2.9 (Lebesgue measure of a regular set)**.** *Let $X \subset [-\alpha_1, \alpha_1]$ be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales $\alpha_0 > 0$ to α_1. Then the Lebesgue measure of X satisfies*

$$\mu_L(X) \leq 24 C_R^2 \alpha_1^\delta \alpha_0^{1-\delta}. \tag{2.12}$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 2.8 with $I := [0, \alpha_1]$, $\rho := \alpha_0$, we cover $X \cap I$ with at most $12 C_R^2 (\alpha_1/\alpha_0)^\delta$ intervals of size α_0 each. It follows that

$$\mu_L(X \cap I) \;\leq\; 12 C_R^2 \Big(\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_0}\Big)^\delta \cdot \alpha_0 \;=\; 12 C_R^2 \alpha_1^\delta \alpha_0^{1-\delta}.$$

Repeating the argument with $I := [-\alpha_1, 0]$ and combining the resulting two bounds, we get (2.12). □

We finally describe a tree discretizing a δ-regular set. (This tree is simpler than the one used in [DZ16] and [DJ17] because we do not merge consecutive intervals.) Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a set and fix an integer $L \geq 2$, the base of the discretization. Put

$$V_n(X) := \Big\{ I = \Big[\frac{j}{L^n}, \frac{j+1}{L^n}\Big] \;\Big|\; j \in \mathbb{Z},\; I \cap X \neq \emptyset \Big\}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.13}$$

Note that $X \subset \bigcup_{I \in V_n(x)} I$ for all n. Moreover, each $I' \in V_n(X)$ is contained in exactly one $I \in V_{n-1}(X)$; we say that I is the *parent* of I' and I' is a *child* of I. Each interval has at most L children.

The next lemma, used in §3.4, follows immediately from Lemma 2.6:

Lemma 2.10 (Each parent is missing a child)**.** *Let X be a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales α_0 to α_1, and $0 \leq \delta < 1$. Let L satisfy (2.10) and take $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\alpha_0 \leq L^{-n-1} \leq L^{-n} \leq \alpha_1$. Then each $I \in V_n(X)$ has at most $L - 1$ children.*

2.3. **The multiplier theorem.** The following multiplier theorem is originally due to Beurling–Malliavin [BM62]. We refer the reader to Mashreghi–Nazarov–Havin [MNH06] for a discussion of the history of this theorem and recent results.

Theorem 5. [MNH06, Theorem BM1] *Let $\omega \in C^1(\mathbb{R}; (0,1])$ satisfy the conditions*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\log \omega(\xi)|}{1+\xi^2}\, d\xi < \infty, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\sup |\partial_\xi \log \omega| < \infty. \tag{2.15}$$

Then for each $c_0 > 0$ there exists a function $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\operatorname{supp} \psi \subset [-c_0, c_0], \quad |\widehat{\psi}| \leq \omega, \quad \psi \not\equiv 0. \tag{2.16}$$

We will use in §3.1 the following quantitative refinement of Theorem 5:

Lemma 2.11. *Let $C_0, c_0 > 0$ and $\omega \in C^1(\mathbb{R}; (0,1])$ be a weight function satisfying*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\log \omega(\xi)|}{1+\xi^2}\, d\xi \le C_0, \tag{2.17}$$

$$\sup |\partial_\xi \log \omega| \le C_0. \tag{2.18}$$

Then there exist $c > 0$ depending only on C_0, c_0 and a function $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$\operatorname{supp}\psi \subset [-c_0, c_0], \quad |\widehat{\psi}| \le \omega^c, \quad \|\widehat{\psi}\|_{L^2(-1,1)} \ge c. \tag{2.19}$$

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Fix $C_0, c_0 > 0$ such that Lemma 2.11 does not hold. Then there exists a sequence of weights $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots$ each satisfying (2.17), (2.18) and such that for each $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$

$$\operatorname{supp}\psi \subset [-c_0, c_0], \quad |\widehat{\psi}| \le (\omega_n)^{2^{-n}} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \|\widehat{\psi}\|_{L^2(-1,1)} \le 2^{-n}. \tag{2.20}$$

Define the weight ω by

$$\omega := \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (\omega_n)^{2^{-n}}.$$

Then ω satisfies (2.14), (2.15). By Theorem 5 there exists $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (2.16). For each n, we have $|\widehat{\psi}| \le \omega \le (\omega_n)^{2^{-n}}$. Then (2.20) implies that $\|\widehat{\psi}\|_{L^2(-1,1)} \le 2^{-n}$ for all n and thus $\widehat{\psi} = 0$ on $(-1,1)$. However, since ψ is compactly supported, $\widehat{\psi}$ is real analytic and thus $\psi \equiv 0$, which contradicts (2.16). □

2.4. **Harmonic measures on slit domains.** We review the facts we need from the theory of harmonic measures, referring the reader to Conway [Co95, Chapter 21], Aleman–Feldman–Ross [AFR09], and Itô–McKean [IM74, §7] for more details.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a bounded open domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and take $t \in \Omega$. The *harmonic measure of Ω centered at t*, denoted μ_t^Ω, is defined as follows. Let $f \in C(\partial\Omega)$ and let u be the harmonic extension of f, namely the unique function such that $u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, $u|_{\partial\Omega} = f$, and u is harmonic in Ω. Then for all f, we have

$$u(t) = \int_{\partial\Omega} f\, d\mu_t^\Omega.$$

Such μ_t^Ω is a (nonnegative) probability measure; indeed, nonnegativity follows from the maximum principle and $\mu_t^\Omega(\partial\Omega) = 1$ since 1 is a harmonic function. Moreover, since $\partial\Omega$ is smooth, μ_t^Ω is absolutely continuous with respect to the arclength measure μ_L on $\partial\Omega$. We denote by $\frac{d\mu_t^\Omega}{d\mu_L}$ the corresponding Radon–Nikodym derivative.

Since harmonic functions are invariant under conformal transformations, we have the following fact: if Ω' is another bounded domain with smooth boundary and $\varkappa : \Omega \to \Omega'$ is a conformal transformation extending to a homeomorphism $\overline{\Omega} \to \overline{\Omega}'$, then

$$\mu_t^\Omega(A) = \mu_{\varkappa(t)}^{\Omega'}(\varkappa(A)) \quad \text{for all } t \in \Omega,\ A \subset \partial\Omega. \tag{2.21}$$



FIGURE 1. A conformal transformation $\varkappa$ from the domain Σ defined in (2.22) onto an annulus shaped domain Ω with smooth boundary, depicted here as a composition of two transformations. We mark the images of the components of $\partial\Sigma$. If we put for simplicity $r := \pi/2$, $I_0 := [0, \log 2]$, then the first transformation is $\zeta = \frac{e^z-1}{2-e^z}$ and the second one is $w = \frac{1}{1-i\sqrt{\zeta}}$ where we take the branch of the square root which sends $\mathbb{C} \setminus [0, \infty)$ to the upper half-plane.

Another interpretation of harmonic measure is as follows (see for instance [IM74, §7.12]): let $(W_\tau)_{\tau \geq 0}$ be the Brownian motion starting at $W_0 = t$. Then μ_t^Ω is the probability distribution of the point on $\partial\Omega$ through which W_τ exits Ω first.

We henceforth consider the following domain in $\mathbb{C}$:

$$\Sigma := \{x + iy \mid x \in \mathbb{R},\ |y| < r\} \setminus I_0 \tag{2.22}$$

where $I_0 \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval with $0 < |I_0| \leq 1$ and $r \in (0, 1)$. The domain Σ is unbounded and it does not have a smooth boundary because of the slit I_0, however one can still define the harmonic measure μ_t^Σ for each $t \in \Sigma$. One way to see this is by taking a conformal transformation $\varkappa$ which maps Σ onto an annulus shaped domain Ω with smooth boundary, see Figure 1 and [AFR09, §2.3], and define μ_t^Σ by (2.21). However $\varkappa$ does not extend to a homeomorphism $\partial\Sigma \to \partial\Omega$ since the images of sequences approaching the same point of I_0 from the top and from the bottom have different limits. To fix this issue, we redefine $\partial\Sigma$ as consisting of two lines

$$\partial_\pm\Sigma := \{x \pm ir \mid x \in \mathbb{R}\} \tag{2.23}$$

and two copies $I_\pm$ of the interval I_0 corresponding to limits as $\operatorname{Im} z \to \pm 0$. This is in agreement with the Brownian motion interpretation as it encodes in which direction W_τ crosses I_0.

The importance of harmonic measures in this paper is due to the following

Lemma 2.12. *Assume that the function F is holomorphic and bounded on Σ and extends continuously to $\partial\Sigma$. Then for each $t \in \Sigma$ we have*

$$\log|F(t)| \leq \int_{\partial\Sigma} \log|F|\, d\mu_t^\Sigma. \tag{2.24}$$

Proof. The function $\log|F|$ is subharmonic and bounded above on Σ. Then (2.24) follows from Perron's construction of solutions to the Dirichlet problem via subharmonic functions, see for instance [Co95, §19.7]. □

We now show several estimates on the harmonic measure μ_t^Σ for the domain (2.22). Denote by $d(t, I_0)$ the distance from $t \in \mathbb{R}$ to the interval I_0. In Lemmas 2.13–2.15 below, the precise dependence of the bounds on I_0 is irrelevant. However, the dependence on r is important.

Lemma 2.13. *Assume that $t \in \Sigma \cap \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $d(t, I_0) \geq \frac{1}{10}|I_0|$. Then*

$$\Big\| \frac{d\mu_t^\Sigma}{d\mu_L} \Big\|_{L^p(I_\pm)} \leq C_p \quad \text{for all } p \in [1, 2) \tag{2.25}$$

where $C_p > 0$ depends only on $|I_0|$ and p.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $I_0 = [0, \ell]$ where $0 < \ell \leq 1$. We have $\Sigma \subset \widetilde{\Sigma}$ where

$$\widetilde{\Sigma} := \mathbb{C} \setminus I_0.$$

Then (see for instance [Co95, Corollary 21.1.14])

$$\mu_t^\Sigma|_{I_\pm} \ \leq \ \mu_t^{\widetilde{\Sigma}}|_{I_\pm}. \tag{2.26}$$

We can also interpret (2.26) in stochastic terms: every trajectory of the Brownian motion starting at t which hits some $A \subset I_\pm$ before hitting $\partial\Sigma \setminus A$ also has the property that it hits A before $\partial\widetilde{\Sigma} \setminus A$.

To compute $\mu_t^{\widetilde{\Sigma}}$ we use the conformal transformation

$$z \mapsto w = \sqrt{\frac{t-\ell}{t} \cdot \frac{z}{\ell - z}}$$

which maps $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ to the upper half-plane, $I_\pm$ to $\pm[0, \infty)$, and t to i. Using the well-known formula for the harmonic measure of the upper half-plane, we get

$$\mu_t^{\widetilde{\Sigma}}|_{I_\pm} = \frac{|dw|}{\pi(1+w^2)} = \sqrt{\frac{t(t-\ell)}{z(\ell-z)}} \cdot \frac{|dz|}{2\pi|t-z|}.$$

Since $|t - z| \geq \frac{\ell}{10}$ for all $z \in [0, \ell]$, it follows that

$$\frac{d\mu_t^\Sigma}{d\mu_L}(z) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{z(\ell - z)}} \quad \text{for all } z \in I_\pm$$

which implies (2.25). □

Lemma 2.14. *Assume that $t \in \Sigma \cap \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $d(t, I_0) \leq 1$. Then*

$$\frac{d\mu_t^\Sigma}{d\mu_L}(x \pm ir) \leq \frac{2}{r} e^{-d(x, I_0)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof. We have $\Sigma \subset \widetilde{\Sigma}$ where

$$\widetilde{\Sigma} := \{(x+iy) \mid x \in \mathbb{R},\ |y| < r\}.$$

Therefore, similarly to (2.26) we have $\mu_t^{\Sigma}|_{\partial_\pm \Sigma} \le \mu_t^{\widetilde{\Sigma}}|_{\partial_\pm \Sigma}$. The conformal transformation

$$z \mapsto w = i \exp\left(\frac{\pi(z-t)}{2r}\right)$$

maps $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ to the upper half-plane, $\partial_\pm \Sigma$ to $\mp[0,\infty)$, and t to i. Therefore

$$\mu_t^{\widetilde{\Sigma}}|_{\partial_\pm \Sigma} = \frac{|dw|}{\pi(1+w^2)} = \frac{|dz|}{4r \cosh\left(\pi \frac{\operatorname{Re} z - t}{2r}\right)}.$$

It follows that

$$\left|\frac{d\mu_t^{\Sigma}}{d\mu_L}(x \pm ir)\right| \ \le\ \frac{1}{2r} e^{-\frac{\pi|x-t|}{2r}} \ \le\ \frac{1}{2r} e^{-|x-t|} \ \le\ \frac{2}{r} e^{-d(x,I_0)}. \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.15. *Assume that $t \in \Sigma \cap \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $d(t, I_0) \le 1$. Then*

$$\mu_t^{\Sigma}(I_\pm) \ge \frac{|I_0|}{8} e^{-2/r}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $I_0 = [-\ell, 0]$ where $0 < \ell \le 1$, and $0 < t \le 1$. We have $\Sigma \supset \widetilde{\Sigma}$ where

$$\widetilde{\Sigma} = \{x+iy \mid x \in \mathbb{R},\ |y| < r\} \setminus (-\infty, 0].$$

Similarly to (2.26) we have $\mu_t^{\Sigma}(I_\pm) \ge \mu_t^{\widetilde{\Sigma}}(I_\pm)$. The conformal transformation

$$z \mapsto w = \sqrt{\frac{1 - e^{\pi z/r}}{e^{\pi t/r} - 1}}$$

maps $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ to the upper half-plane, t to i, and

$$I_\pm \ \mapsto\ \mp\left[0, \sqrt{\frac{1 - e^{-\pi \ell/r}}{e^{\pi t/r} - 1}}\right] \ \supset\ \mp\left[0, \frac{\sqrt{\ell}}{2} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2r}}\right].$$

It follows that

$$\mu_t^{\Sigma}(I_\pm) \ \ge\ \mu_t^{\widetilde{\Sigma}}(I_\pm) \ \ge\ \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{\sqrt{\ell}}{2} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2r}}\right) \ \ge\ \frac{\ell}{8} e^{-2/r}. \quad \square$$

3. General fractal uncertainty principle

In this section, we prove Theorem 4. We establish the components of the argument in §§3.1,3.2 and combine them in §3.3 to obtain a unique continuation estimate for functions with Fourier supports in regular sets. In §3.4, we iterate this estimate to finish the proof.

3.1. **An adapted multiplier.** We first construct a compactly supported function whose Fourier transform decays much faster than $\exp(-|\xi|/\log|\xi|)$ as $|\xi|\to\infty$ on a δ-regular set:

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $Y\subset[-\alpha_1,\alpha_1]$ is a δ-regular set with constant C_R on scales 2 to α_1, and $\delta\in(0,1)$. Fix $c_1>0$. Then there exist a constant $c_2>0$ depending only on δ, C_R, c_1 and a function $\psi\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that*

$$\operatorname{supp}\psi\subset\Big[-\frac{c_1}{10},\frac{c_1}{10}\Big], \tag{3.1}$$

$$\|\widehat{\psi}\|_{L^2([-1,1])}\geq c_2, \tag{3.2}$$

$$|\widehat{\psi}(\xi)|\leq\exp(-c_2\langle\xi\rangle^{1/2})\quad\text{for all }\xi\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$|\widehat{\psi}(\xi)|\leq\exp\Big(-c_2\big(\log|\xi|\big)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}\cdot|\xi|\Big)\quad\text{for all }\xi\in Y,\ |\xi|\geq 10. \tag{3.4}$$

Remarks. 1. It is essential that condition (3.4) be imposed only on Y. Indeed, it is a standard fact in harmonic analysis (see for instance [HJ94, §1.5.4]) that every compactly supported $\psi\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\psi\not\equiv 0$ satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}}\frac{\log|\widehat{\psi}(\xi)|}{1+|\xi|^2}\,d\xi>-\infty$$

which would contradict (3.4) if Y were replaced by $\mathbb{R}$.

2. In (3.3) one could replace $\exp(-\langle\xi\rangle^{1/2})$ by any weight satisfying (2.14), (2.15) and decaying as $|\xi|\to\infty$ faster than any negative power of $|\xi|$. Also, the proof below works with $\frac{1+\delta}{2}$ replaced by 1, though in that case (3.4) would not suffice for our application.

Proof. We will use Lemma 2.11. For this we construct a weight adapted to the set Y. Define $n_1\in\mathbb{N}$ by the inequality $2^{n_1}\leq\alpha_1<2^{n_1+1}$. For every $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $n\leq n_1$, put

$$A_n:=[-2^{n+1},-2^n]\sqcup[2^n,2^{n+1}],\quad \rho_n:=n^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}\cdot 2^n\geq 2.$$

Using Lemma 2.8, construct a nonoverlapping collection $\mathcal{J}_n$ of N_n intervals of size ρ_n each such that all elements of $\mathcal{J}_n$ intersect A_n and

$$Y\cap A_n\subset\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}_n}J,\quad N_n\leq 24C_R^2\cdot\Big(\frac{2^n}{\rho_n}\Big)^{\delta}.$$

Fix a cutoff function

$$\chi(\xi)\in C^1(\mathbb{R};[0,1]),\quad\sup|\partial_\xi\chi|\leq 10,\quad\operatorname{supp}\chi\subset[-1,1],\quad\chi=1\quad\text{on }\Big[-\frac12,\frac12\Big].$$

For an interval J with center ξ_J, define the function $\chi_J\in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$\chi_J(\xi)=|J|\cdot\chi\Big(\frac{\xi-\xi_J}{|J|}\Big),$$



FIGURE 2. The functions χ_J featured in (3.5), where the intervals J are shaded. The dots mark powers of 2.

so that

$$0 \le \chi_J \le |J|, \quad \sup|\partial_\xi \chi_J| \le 10,$$
$$\operatorname{supp}\chi_J \subset \widetilde{J} := \xi_J + \big[-|J|, |J|\big], \quad \chi_J = |J| \quad \text{on } J.$$

Now, define the weight $\omega \in C^1(\mathbb{R}; (0,1])$ by (see Figure 2)

$$\omega(\xi) := \exp(-\langle\xi\rangle^{1/2}) \cdot \prod_{n=1}^{n_1} \prod_{J\in\mathcal{J}_n} \exp(-10\chi_J). \tag{3.5}$$

For each $\xi \in Y$, $|\xi| \ge 2$, there exists $n \in [1, n_1]$ and $J \in \mathcal{J}_n$ such that $\xi \in J$. Therefore

$$\omega(\xi) \le \exp(-\langle\xi\rangle^{1/2}) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.6}$$
$$\omega(\xi) \le \exp\Big(-\big(\log|\xi|\big)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \cdot |\xi|\Big) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in Y,\ |\xi| \ge 10. \tag{3.7}$$

Since each ξ lies in at most 500 intervals in $\bigcup_{n=1}^{n_1}\bigcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}_n}\widetilde{J}$, we have

$$\sup|\partial_\xi \log\omega| \le 10^5.$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\log\omega(\xi)|}{1+\xi^2}\,d\xi &\le 100 + 10^5 \sum_{n=1}^{n_1} N_n \cdot 2^{-2n}\rho_n^2 \\ &\le 10^5 + 10^7 C_R^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Big(\frac{2^n}{\rho_n}\Big)^{\delta-2} =: C_0\end{aligned}$$

where C_0 depends only on δ, C_R. Here we use the formula for ρ_n and the inequality $(1+\delta)(1-\delta/2) > 1$ valid for all $\delta \in (0,1)$.

We have verified that the weight ω satisfies (2.17) and (2.18). Applying Lemma 2.11 with $c_0 := c_1/10$, we construct $\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying (3.1) and

$$|\widehat{\psi}| \le \omega^{c_2}, \quad \|\widehat{\psi}\|_{L^2(-1,1)} \ge c_2,$$

where the constant c_2 depends only on δ, C_R, c_1. By (3.6) and (3.7), ψ satisfies (3.3) and (3.4). □



FIGURE 3. The slit domain Σ_I with the intervals $I_0 \subset I'' \subset I$.

3.2. **A bound on functions with compact Fourier support.** We next use the harmonic measure estimates from §2.4 to obtain the following

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that $\mathcal{I}$ is a nonoverlapping collection of intervals of size 1 each, and for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ we choose a subinterval $I'' \subset I$ with $|I''| = c_0 > 0$ independent of I. Then there exists a constant C depending only on c_0 such that for all $r \in (0,1)$, $0 < \kappa \le e^{-C/r}$, and $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\hat f$ compactly supported, we have*

$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \|f\|^2_{L^2(I)} \le \frac{C}{r}\Big(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \|f\|^2_{L^2(I'')}\Big)^{\kappa} \cdot \|e^{2\pi r|\xi|}\hat f(\xi)\|^{2(1-\kappa)}_{L^2}. \tag{3.8}$$

Remark. By an approximation argument, this statement applies also to $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that $e^{2\pi r|\xi|}\hat f(\xi) \in L^2$. In particular, we recover the unique continuation property for such f (which of course also follows from the fact that f is real analytic).

Proof. Since $\hat f$ is compactly supported, f has a holomorphic continuation F given by (2.3):

$$F(z) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i z\xi}\hat f(\xi)\,d\xi, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}; \quad f = F|_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

The function $F(z)$ is bounded on $\{|\operatorname{Im} z| \le r\}$ and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |F(x \pm ir)|^2\,dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |e^{\mp 2\pi r\xi}\hat f(\xi)|^2\,d\xi \le \|e^{2\pi r|\xi|}\hat f(\xi)\|^2_{L^2}. \tag{3.9}$$

For each $I \in \mathcal{I}$, let $I_0 \Subset I''$ be the interval with the same center as I'' and $|I_0| = \frac12 c_0$. Define the slit domain (see Figure 3)

$$\Sigma_I := \{x + iy \mid x \in \mathbb{R},\ |y| < r\} \setminus I_0.$$

For each $t \in I \setminus I'' \subset \Sigma_I$, let $\mu_t = \mu_t^{\Sigma_I}$ be the harmonic measure of Σ_I on

$$\partial\Sigma_I = I_0 \sqcup \partial_-\Sigma_I \sqcup \partial_+\Sigma_I, \quad \partial_\pm\Sigma_I = \{x \pm ir \mid x \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

centered at t. Here we put together the top and bottom copies $I_\pm$ of I_0 (see the paragraph following (2.23)), that is for $A \subset I_0$ we have $\mu_t(A) = \mu_t(A\cap I_+) + \mu_t(A\cap I_-)$.

By Lemma 2.15, we have

$$\kappa_I := \mu_t(I_0) \;\geq\; \frac{c_0}{8} e^{-2/r} \;\geq\; e^{-C/r} \;\geq\; \kappa$$

where C denotes a constant depending only on c_0 (whose value might differ in different parts of the proof). By Lemma 2.12 we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} 2\log|f(t)| &\leq \int_{\partial\Sigma_I} 2\log|F(z)|\,d\mu_t(z) \\ &= 4\kappa_I \cdot \frac{1}{\kappa_I}\int_{I_0} \frac{\log|f(x)|}{2}\,d\mu_t(x) + (1-\kappa_I)\cdot\frac{1}{1-\kappa_I}\int_{\partial_-\Sigma_I\sqcup\partial_+\Sigma_I} 2\log|F(z)|\,d\mu_t(z). \end{aligned}$$

Since the exponential function is convex and $\frac{1}{\kappa_I}\mu_t|_{I_0}$, $\frac{1}{1-\kappa_I}\mu_t|_{\partial_-\Sigma_I\sqcup\partial_+\Sigma_I}$ are probability measures, we obtain

$$|f(t)|^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{\kappa_I}\int_{I_0}|f(x)|^{1/2}\,d\mu_t(x)\right)^{4\kappa_I}\cdot\left(\frac{1}{1-\kappa_I}\int_{\partial_-\Sigma_I\sqcup\partial_+\Sigma_I}|F(z)|^2\,d\mu_t(z)\right)^{1-\kappa_I}.$$

Since $\kappa \leq \kappa_I < 1$ and $\lambda^{-\lambda} \leq \exp(1/e)$ for all $\lambda > 0$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |f(t)|^2 \leq 10&\left(\int_{I_0}|f(x)|^{1/2}\,d\mu_t(x)\right)^{4\kappa} \\ &\cdot\left(\left(\int_{I_0}|f(x)|^{1/2}\,d\mu_t(x)\right)^4 + \int_{\partial_-\Sigma_I\sqcup\partial_+\Sigma_I}|F(z)|^2\,d\mu_t(z)\right)^{1-\kappa}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Recall that $t \in I \setminus I''$. By Lemma 2.13 with $p = 4/3$ and Hölder's inequality we have

$$\left(\int_{I_0}|f(x)|^{1/2}\,d\mu_t(x)\right)^4 \leq C\|f\|^2_{L^2(I_0)} \tag{3.11}$$

and by Lemma 2.14

$$\int_{\partial_-\Sigma_I\sqcup\partial_+\Sigma_I}|F(z)|^2\,d\mu_t(z) \leq \frac{C}{r}\int_{\operatorname{Im} z\in\{\pm r\}} e^{-d(\operatorname{Re} z, I)}|F(z)|^2 dz. \tag{3.12}$$

Combining (3.10)–(3.12) we get

$$|f(t)|^2 \leq \frac{C}{r}\|f\|^{2\kappa}_{L^2(I_0)}\cdot\left(\int_{\operatorname{Im} z\in\{0,\pm r\}} e^{-d(\operatorname{Re} z, I)}|F(z)|^2\,dz\right)^{1-\kappa}.$$

Integrating in $t \in I \setminus I''$ and using Hölder's inequality (2.9), we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\|f\|^2_{L^2(I\setminus I'')} &\leq \frac{C}{r}\left(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\|f\|^2_{L^2(I_0)}\right)^{\kappa}\cdot\left(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\int_{\operatorname{Im} z\in\{0,\pm r\}} e^{-d(\operatorname{Re} z, I)}|F(z)|^2\,dz\right)^{1-\kappa} \\ &\leq \frac{C}{r}\left(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}}\|f\|^2_{L^2(I'')}\right)^{\kappa}\cdot\left(\int_{\operatorname{Im} z\in\{0,\pm r\}}|F(z)|^2\,dz\right)^{1-\kappa}. \end{aligned}$$



FIGURE 4. The sets U' (light shaded) and U'' (dark shaded) used in Proposition 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, with endpoints of the intervals $I \in \mathcal{I}$ denoted by dots.

Combining this with (3.9) and the bound

$$\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \|f\|^2_{L^2(I'')} \le \bigg(\sum_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \|f\|^2_{L^2(I'')}\bigg)^{\kappa} \cdot \|e^{2\pi r|\xi|}\hat f(\xi)\|^{2(1-\kappa)}_{L^2}$$

we obtain (3.8). □

3.3. **The iterative step.** The key component of the proof of Theorem 4 is the following unique continuation property for functions with Fourier support in a δ-regular set:

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that $Y \subset [-\alpha_1, \alpha_1]$ is δ-regular with constant C_R on scales 1 to α_1, and $\delta \in (0,1)$. Take*

$$\mathcal{I} := \big\{[j, j+1] \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}\big\} \tag{3.13}$$

and assume that for each $I \in \mathcal{I}$ we are given a subinterval $I' \subset I$ with $|I'| = c_1 > 0$ independent of I. (See Figure 4.) Define

$$U' := \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{I}} I'.$$

Then there exists $c_3 > 0$ depending only on δ, C_R, c_1 such that for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\operatorname{supp}\hat f \subset Y$, we have

$$\|f\|_{L^2(U')} \ge c_3\|f\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.14}$$

Remark. It is important that U' be the union of infinitely many intervals, rather than a single interval. Indeed, the following estimate is false:

$$f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \quad \operatorname{supp}\hat f \subset [-1,1] \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \|f\|_{L^2(-1,1)} \ge c\|f\|_{L^2(-2,2)}$$

as can be seen by taking $f(x) = x^N\chi(x)$, where χ is a Schwartz function with $\operatorname{supp}\hat\chi \subset [-1,1]$, and letting $N \to \infty$.

Henceforth in this section C denotes a constant which only depends on δ, C_R, c_1. For $f \in L^2$, denote by $\|f\|_{H^{-10}}$ its Sobolev norm defined in (2.5). The main ingredient of the proof of Proposition 3.3 is the following lemma, which combines the results of §§3.1–3.2:

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that $Z \subset [-\alpha_1, \alpha_1]$ is δ-regular with constant C_R on scales 1 to $\alpha_1 \geq 2$, and $\delta \in (0,1)$. Let $\{I'\}_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$ be as in Proposition 3.3. Then we have for all $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\operatorname{supp} \hat{f} \subset Z$, all $K > 10$, and $\kappa := \exp\big(-C(\log K)^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}}\big)$,*

$$\|\hat{f}\|^2_{L^2(-1,1)} \leq CK^{21}\Big(\|\mathbb{1}_{U'} f\|^2_{H^{-10}} + \exp\big(-C^{-1}(\log K)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}K\big)\|f\|^2_{H^{-10}}\Big)^{\kappa} \cdot \|f\|^{2(1-\kappa)}_{H^{-10}}.$$

Proof. For each $I \in \mathcal{I}$, let $I'' \Subset I'$ be the interval with the same center as I' and $|I''| = \frac{1}{2}c_1$. Denote

$$U'' := \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{I}} I''.$$

Let ψ be the function constructed in Lemma 3.1 for Y replaced by

$$Z(2) := Z + [-2, 2].$$

Here $Z(2) \subset [-(\alpha_1+2), \alpha_1+2]$ is a δ-regular set with constant $100C_R$ on scales 2 to α_1+2 by Lemmas 2.3 and 2.2. By (3.2)–(3.4) we have for some $c_2 \in (0,1)$ depending only on δ, C_R, c_1

$$\|\widehat{\psi}\|_{L^2(-1,1)} \geq c_2, \tag{3.15}$$

$$|\widehat{\psi}(\xi)| \leq \exp(-c_2\langle\xi\rangle^{1/2}) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{3.16}$$

$$|\widehat{\psi}(\xi)| \leq \exp\Big(-c_2\big(\log(10+|\xi|)\big)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \cdot |\xi|\Big) \quad \text{for all } \xi \in Z(2). \tag{3.17}$$

Take arbitrary $\eta \in [-2,2]$ and let $f_\eta(x) := e^{2\pi i\eta x} f(x)$, so that $\hat{f}_\eta(\xi) = \hat{f}(\xi-\eta)$. Put

$$g_\eta := f_\eta * \psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

By the support condition (3.1),

$$g_\eta = (\mathbb{1}_{U'} f_\eta) * \psi \quad \text{on } U''. \tag{3.18}$$

By (2.4), (3.17), and since $\operatorname{supp} \hat{f}_\eta \subset Z + \eta \subset Z(2)$, we have

$$|\hat{g}_\eta(\xi)| \leq \exp\Big(-c_2\big(\log(10+|\xi|)\big)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \cdot |\xi|\Big) \cdot |\hat{f}_\eta(\xi)| \quad \text{for all } \xi \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.19}$$

Put

$$r := \frac{c_2}{10}(\log K)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \in (0,1).$$

Note that

$$\sup_{|\xi|\leq K} e^{2\pi r|\xi|} \exp\Big(-c_2\big(\log(10+|\xi|)\big)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}} \cdot |\xi|\Big) \leq 1. \tag{3.20}$$

We now decompose g_η into low and high frequencies:

$$g_\eta = g_1 + g_2, \quad g_1, g_2 \in L^2, \quad \operatorname{supp} \hat{g}_1 \subset \{|\xi| \leq K\}, \quad \operatorname{supp} \hat{g}_2 \subset \{|\xi| \geq K\}.$$

Then by (3.19) and (3.20)

$$\|e^{2\pi r|\xi|}\hat g_1(\xi)\|_{L^2}\le CK^{10}\|f\|_{H^{-10}}, \tag{3.21}$$

$$\|g_2\|_{L^2}\le C\exp\big(-C^{-1}(\log K)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}K\big)\|f\|_{H^{-10}}. \tag{3.22}$$

Applying Lemma 3.2 to the function g_1 and using (3.21), we get

$$\|g_1\|_{L^2}^2\le\frac{CK^{20}}{r}\|g_1\|_{L^2(U'')}^{2\kappa}\cdot\|f\|_{H^{-10}}^{2(1-\kappa)},\quad \kappa:=e^{-C/r}. \tag{3.23}$$

By (3.18), (2.4), and (3.16)

$$\begin{aligned}\|g_1\|_{L^2(U'')}&\le\|g_\eta\|_{L^2(U'')}+\|g_2\|_{L^2}\le\|(\mathbb{1}_{U'}f_\eta)*\psi\|_{L^2}+\|g_2\|_{L^2}\\&\le C\|\mathbb{1}_{U'}f\|_{H^{-10}}+\|g_2\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Then by (3.22) and (3.23) and since $r^{-1}\le CK$, we have for all $\eta\in[-2,2]$

$$\begin{aligned}\|g_\eta\|_{L^2}^2&=\|g_1\|_{L^2}^2+\|g_2\|_{L^2}^2\\&\le CK^{21}\Big(\|\mathbb{1}_{U'}f\|_{H^{-10}}^2+\exp\big(-C^{-1}(\log K)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}K\big)\|f\|_{H^{-10}}^2\Big)^{\kappa}\cdot\|f\|_{H^{-10}}^{2(1-\kappa)}.\end{aligned}$$

It remains to use the following corollary of (3.15):

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat f\|_{L^2(-1,1)}^2&\le C\int_{[-1,1]^2}|\hat f(\zeta)\widehat{\psi}(\xi)|^2\,d\xi d\zeta\\&\le C\int_{-2}^2\int_{\mathbb{R}}|\hat f(\xi-\eta)\widehat{\psi}(\xi)|^2\,d\xi d\eta\\&=C\int_{-2}^2\|g_\eta\|_{L^2}^2\,d\eta\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat g_\eta(\xi)=\hat f(\xi-\eta)\widehat{\psi}(\xi)$ by (2.4). □

Armed with Lemma 3.4, we now give

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Take $\ell\in\mathbb{Z}$ such that $|\ell|\le\alpha_1$. By Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 the set $Y+\ell\subset[-2\alpha_1,2\alpha_1]$ is δ-regular with constant $4C_R$ on scales 1 to $2\alpha_1$. Put

$$f_\ell(x):=e^{2\pi i\ell x}f(x),$$

then $\hat f_\ell(\xi)=\hat f(\xi-\ell)$ and thus $\operatorname{supp}\hat f_\ell\subset Y+\ell$. By Lemma 3.4 applied to f_ℓ and $Z:=Y+\ell$, we have for all $K>10$ and $\kappa:=\exp\big(-C(\log K)^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}}\big)$

$$\|\hat f_\ell\|_{L^2(-1,1)}^2\le CK^{21}\Big(\|\mathbb{1}_{U'}f_\ell\|_{H^{-10}}^2+\exp\big(-C^{-1}(\log K)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}K\big)\|f_\ell\|_{H^{-10}}^2\Big)^{\kappa}\cdot\|f_\ell\|_{H^{-10}}^{2(1-\kappa)}.$$

Since $\operatorname{supp} \hat{f} \subset Y \subset [-\alpha_1, \alpha_1]$, we obtain using Hölder's inequality (2.9)

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_{L^2}^2 &\le \sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}:\ |\ell|\le\alpha_1} \|\hat{f}_\ell\|_{L^2(-1,1)}^2 \\ &\le CK^{21}\Big(\sum_\ell \|\mathbb{1}_{U'} f_\ell\|_{H^{-10}}^2 + \exp\big(-C^{-1}(\log K)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}K\big)\sum_\ell \|f_\ell\|_{H^{-10}}^2\Big)^{\kappa} \\ &\quad\cdot \Big(\sum_\ell \|f_\ell\|_{H^{-10}}^2\Big)^{1-\kappa}.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_\ell \|f_\ell\|_{H^{-10}}^2 \le C\|f\|_{L^2}^2, \quad \sum_\ell \|\mathbb{1}_{U'} f_\ell\|_{H^{-10}}^2 \le C\|f\|_{L^2(U')}^2$$

and by the Minkowski inequality $(a+b)^\kappa \le a^\kappa + b^\kappa$, $a, b \ge 0$, we have

$$\|f\|_{L^2}^2 \le CK^{21}\|f\|_{L^2(U')}^{2\kappa}\cdot\|f\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\kappa)} + CK^{21}\exp\big(-C^{-1}(\log K)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}\kappa K\big)\|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

Recalling that $\kappa = \exp\big(-C(\log K)^{\frac{1+\delta}{2}}\big)$ and $\delta < 1$, we have $\kappa K \ge C^{-1}\sqrt{K}$ and thus

$$\lim_{K\to\infty} K^{21}\exp\big(-C^{-1}(\log K)^{-\frac{1+\delta}{2}}\kappa K\big) = 0.$$

Therefore, fixing K large enough depending only on δ, C_R, c_1 we have

$$\|f\|_{L^2}^2 \le CK^{21}\|f\|_{L^2(U')}^{2\kappa}\cdot\|f\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\kappa)}$$

which implies (3.14) with $c_3 = (CK^{21})^{-\frac{1}{2\kappa}}$. □

3.4. **The iteration argument.** We now finish the proof of Theorem 4 by iterating Proposition 3.3. Let δ, C_R, N, X, Y satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 4.

First of all, Lemma 2.9 gives the Lebesgue measure bounds

$$\mu_L(X) \le 24C_R^2 N^{\delta-1}, \quad \mu_L(Y) \le 24C_R^2 N^{\delta}.$$

Applying Hölder's inequality twice and using (2.3), we see that for each $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ with $\operatorname{supp} \hat{f} \subset Y$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_{L^2(X)} &\le \sqrt{\mu_L(X)}\|f\|_{L^\infty} \le \sqrt{\mu_L(X)}\|\hat{f}\|_{L^1} \\ &\le \sqrt{\mu_L(X)\mu_L(Y)}\|\hat{f}\|_{L^2} \le 24C_R^2 N^{\delta-\frac{1}{2}}\|f\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

This implies (1.4) for $\delta < 1/2$ with $\beta = 1/2 - \delta$. Therefore, we henceforth assume that $1/2 \le \delta < 1$ (though we will only use that $0 < \delta < 1$).

Put

$$L := \big\lceil (3C_R)^{\frac{2}{1-\delta}} \big\rceil \in \mathbb{N}$$

so that (2.10) holds. Let $V_n(X)$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, be the elements of the tree of intervals covering X constructed in (2.13). Define

$$U_n := \bigcup_{I \in V_n(X)} I\Big(\frac{1}{10L^n}\Big).$$

Here we use the notation (2.1) for neighborhoods of sets.

We use the sets U_n to construct a family of weights. Let φ be a nonnegative Schwartz function such that

$$\operatorname{supp} \widehat{\varphi} \subset [-1,1], \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(x)\,dx = 1,$$

and define for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\varphi_n(x) := L^n \cdot \varphi(L^n x), \quad \widehat{\varphi_n}(\xi) = \widehat{\varphi}(L^{-n}\xi).$$

Take $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and define for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ the following weight (see Figure 5):

$$\Psi_n := \mathbf{1}_{U_{n+1}} * \varphi_{n+T}.$$

Note that Ψ_n is a Schwartz function and $0 \le \Psi_n \le 1$. The fattening of the intervals in the definition of U_n and the need for the parameter T are explained by the following lemma which is used at the end of the proof:

Lemma 3.5. *There exists a constant C_φ depending only on φ such that for all n*

$$\Psi_n \ge 1 - \frac{C_\varphi}{L^{T-1}} \quad \text{on } X. \tag{3.25}$$

Proof. Let $x \in X$. Then $x \in I$ for some $I \in V_{n+1}(X)$ and thus

$$\Big[x - \frac{1}{10L^{n+1}}, x + \frac{1}{10L^{n+1}}\Big] \subset I\Big(\frac{1}{10L^{n+1}}\Big) \subset U_{n+1}.$$

We have

$$\Psi_n(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{U_{n+1}}(x - L^{-n-T}y)\varphi(y)\,dy \ge \int_{-L^{T-1}/10}^{L^{T-1}/10} \varphi(y)\,dy$$

and (3.25) follows since φ is a Schwartz function of integral 1. □

Next, Proposition 3.3 implies the following

Lemma 3.6. *There exists $\tau > 0$ depending only on δ, C_R such that for all $T \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L^{n+1} \le N$ and*

$$f \in L^2(\mathbb{R}), \quad \operatorname{supp} \hat{f} \subset Y(2L^n),$$

we have $\operatorname{supp} \widehat{\Psi_n f} \subset Y(2L^{n+T})$ *and*

$$\|\Psi_n f\|_{L^2} \le (1-\tau)\|f\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.26}$$



FIGURE 5. The weight Ψ_n for large T and the interval $L^{-n}I'$ used in the proof of Lemma 3.6. The dashed line corresponds to the constant function 1 and the dots mark $L^{-n-1}\mathbb{Z}$; the shaded region is U_{n+1}.

Proof. By (2.4), we have $\operatorname{supp}\widehat{\Psi}_n \subset \operatorname{supp}\widehat{\varphi}_{n+T} \subset [-L^{n+T}, L^{n+T}]$. Since $\widehat{\Psi_n f} = \widehat{\Psi}_n * \hat{f}$,

$$\operatorname{supp}\widehat{\Psi_n f} \ \subset \ \operatorname{supp}\hat{f} + [-L^{n+T}, L^{n+T}]$$

which gives the Fourier support condition on $\Psi_n f$.

It remains to show (3.26). Define the following rescaling of f:

$$\widetilde{f}(x) := L^{-n/2} \cdot f(L^{-n}x).$$

Then $\|\widetilde{f}\|_{L^2(A)} = \|f\|_{L^2(L^{-n}\cdot A)}$ for any set A and, with $\mathcal{F}$ denoting the Fourier transform,

$$\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{F}\widetilde{f} \ \subset \ \widetilde{Y} := \frac{1}{L^n}Y + [-2,2] \ \subset \ [-\alpha_1, \alpha_1], \quad \alpha_1 := \frac{10N}{L^n}.$$

By Lemmas 2.1–2.3 the set $\widetilde{Y}$ is δ-regular with constant $1000C_R$ on scales 1 to α_1.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the partition of $\mathbb{R}$ into size 1 intervals defined in (3.13). For each $I \in \mathcal{I}$, choose an interval $I' \subset I$ of size $c_1 := (2L)^{-1}$ as follows. There exists $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $I_j := L^{-1}[j, j+1]$ is contained in I and satisfies $L^{-n}I_j \notin V_{n+1}(X)$. Indeed, for $L^{-n}I \notin V_n(X)$ this is obvious (as one can take any I_j contained in I) and for $L^{-n}I \in V_n(X)$ it follows by Lemma 2.10. We then let $I' \subset I_j$ have the same center as I_j and size $|I'| = c_1 = \frac{1}{2}|I_j|$. Note that (see Figure 5)

$$L^{-n}I' \cap U_{n+1}\Big(\frac{1}{10L^{n+T}}\Big) = \emptyset. \tag{3.27}$$

Applying Proposition 3.3 to the function $\widetilde{f}$, the set $\widetilde{Y}$, and the subintervals I' described in the previous paragraph, we obtain for some $c_3 > 0$ depending only on δ, C_R

$$\|\widetilde{f}\|_{L^2(U')} \geq c_3\|\widetilde{f}\|_{L^2}, \quad U' := \bigcup_{I\in\mathcal{I}} I',$$

therefore

$$\|f\|_{L^2(L^{-n}\cdot U')} \geq c_3\|f\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.28}$$

By (3.27) we have

$$\Psi_n \le c_\varphi \quad \text{on } L^{-n}U', \quad c_\varphi := \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus[-\frac{1}{10},\frac{1}{10}]} \varphi(x)\,dx < 1.$$

Since $0 \le \Psi_n \le 1$, together with (3.28) this implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Psi_n f\|_{L^2}^2 &\le c_\varphi^2 \|f\|^2_{L^2(L^{-n}\cdot U')} + \|f\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}\setminus(L^{-n}\cdot U'))}\\ &= \|f\|_{L^2}^2 - (1-c_\varphi^2)\|f\|^2_{L^2(L^{-n}\cdot U')}\\ &\le \|f\|_{L^2}^2 - (1-c_\varphi^2)c_3^2\|f\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}$$

This gives (3.26) where τ is defined by $(1-\tau)^2 = 1-(1-c_\varphi^2)c_3^2$. □

We are now ready to finish the

Proof of Theorem 4. Assume that $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $\operatorname{supp} \hat f \subset Y$. Fix large $T \in \mathbb{N}$ to be chosen below. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$f_m := \Big(\prod_{\ell=1}^{m-1} \Psi_{\ell T}\Big) f.$$

Iterating Lemma 3.6, we see that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L^{(m-1)T+1} \le N$, we have

$$\|f_m\|_{L^2} \le (1-\tau)^{m-1}\|f\|_{L^2}, \quad \operatorname{supp} \hat f_m \subset Y(2L^{mT}).$$

Then by Lemma 3.5, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $L^{(m-1)T+1} \le N$

$$\|f\|_{L^2(X)} \le \Big(1-\frac{C_\varphi}{L^{T-1}}\Big)^{1-m}\|f_m\|_{L^2} \le \Big(1-\frac{C_\varphi}{L^{T-1}}\Big)^{1-m}(1-\tau)^{m-1}\|f\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.29}$$

Fix T large enough depending only on δ, C_R so that

$$\Big(1-\frac{C_\varphi}{L^{T-1}}\Big)^{-1}(1-\tau) \le 1-\frac{\tau}{2}.$$

Then (3.29) gives

$$\|f\|_{L^2(X)} \le \Big(1-\frac{\tau}{2}\Big)^{m-1}\|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Taking m such that $L^{(m-1)T+1} \le N \le L^{mT+1}$, we get (1.4) with

$$\beta = -\frac{\log\big(1-\frac{\tau}{2}\big)}{T\log L},$$

finishing the proof. □

4. Hyperbolic fractal uncertainty principle

In this section, we generalize Theorem 4 first by allowing a variable amplitude (§4.1) and then by taking a general phase (§4.2). Both generalizations are stated using the semiclassical parameter $h > 0$ corresponding to the inverse of the frequency. In §4.3, we apply the result of §4.2 to prove Theorem 3.

4.1. **Uncertainty principle with variable amplitude.** We first prove the following semiclassical rescaling of Theorem 4 which also relaxes the assumptions on the supports of X, Y. Recall the notation (2.1) for neighborhoods of sets and the semiclassical Fourier transform (2.6).

Proposition 4.1. *Let $0 \leq \delta < 1$, $C_R \geq 1$ and assume that $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}$ are δ-regular with constant C_R on scales 0 to 1. Let $I_X, I_Y \subset \mathbb{R}$ be intervals with $|I_X|, |I_Y| \leq C_I$. Then there exists $\beta > 0$ depending only on δ, C_R and $C > 0$ depending only on δ, C_R, C_I such that for all $h \in (0,1)$*

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X(h)\cap I_X} \mathcal{F}_h^* \mathbb{1}_{Y(h)\cap I_Y} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})\to L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq Ch^\beta. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that h is small depending on δ, C_R. By Lemma 2.3, the sets $X(h), Y(h)$ are δ-regular with constant $8C_R$ on scales h to 1. By Lemma 2.7 there exist collections of disjoint intervals $\mathcal{J}_X, \mathcal{J}_Y$ such that

$$\begin{gathered} X(h) = \bigsqcup_{J\in\mathcal{J}_X} X_J, \quad X_J := X(h)\cap J; \\ Y(h) = \bigsqcup_{J'\in\mathcal{J}_Y} Y_{J'}, \quad Y_{J'} := Y(h)\cap J'; \\ (32C_R)^{-\frac{2}{1-\delta}} \leq |J| \leq 1 \quad \text{for all } J \in \mathcal{J}_X \cup \mathcal{J}_Y, \end{gathered}$$

and the sets $X_J, Y_{J'}$ are δ-regular with constant $\widetilde{C}_R := (100C_R)^{\frac{2}{1-\delta}} C_R$ on scales h to 1.

We have the following estimate for each $J \in \mathcal{J}_X$, $J' \in \mathcal{J}_Y$, where $\beta, C > 0$ depend only on δ, C_R:

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X_J} \mathcal{F}_h^* \mathbb{1}_{Y_{J'}} \|_{L^2\to L^2} \leq Ch^\beta. \tag{4.2}$$

Indeed, since $X_J, Y_{J'}$ have diameter no more than 1, we may shift $X_J, Y_{J'}$ to make them lie inside $[-1,1]$. By (2.7) this does not change the left-hand side of (4.2); by Lemma 2.1 it does not change δ-regularity. Take arbitrary $g \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and put $f := \mathcal{F}_h^* \mathbb{1}_{Y_{J'}} g$ and $N := h^{-1}$. Then $\operatorname{supp} \hat{f}$ lies in $N \cdot Y_{J'}$, which by Lemma 2.1 is δ-regular with constant $\widetilde{C}_R$ on scales 1 to N. Applying Theorem 4, we obtain

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X_J} \mathcal{F}_h^* \mathbb{1}_{Y_{J'}} g\|_{L^2} \;=\; \| \mathbb{1}_{X_J} f\|_{L^2} \;\leq\; Ch^\beta \|f\|_{L^2} \;\leq\; Ch^\beta \|g\|_{L^2}$$

implying (4.2).

Next, the number of intervals in $\mathcal{J}_X$ intersecting I_X is bounded as follows:

$$\#\{J \in \mathcal{J}_X \mid J \cap I_X \neq \emptyset\} \;\leq\; (32C_R)^{\frac{2}{1-\delta}} C_I + 2$$

and a similar estimate holds for the number of intervals in $\mathcal{J}_Y$ intersecting I_Y. Combining these estimates with (4.2) and using the triangle inequality (2.8), we obtain (4.1), finishing the proof. □

We now prove a fractal uncertainty principle for operators $A = A(h) : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to L^2(\mathbb{R})$ of the form

$$Af(x) = h^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i x\xi/h} a(x,\xi) f(\xi)\, d\xi \tag{4.3}$$

where $a(x,\xi) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies for each k and some constants C_k, C_a

$$\sup |\partial_x^k a| \le C_k, \quad \operatorname{diam}\operatorname{supp} a \le C_a. \tag{4.4}$$

In the statement below it is convenient to replace neighborhoods of size h by those of size h^ρ where $\rho \in (0,1)$. In practice we will take ρ very close to 1 so that the resulting losses do not negate the gain h^β. The proof of Proposition 4.2 relies on Proposition 4.1 and the fact that for $\rho < 1$, functions in the range of $A(h)\,\mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)}$ are concentrated on $Y(2h^\rho)$ in the semiclassical Fourier space.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $0 \le \delta < 1$, $C_R \ge 1$ and assume that $X, Y \subset \mathbb{R}$ are δ-regular with constant C_R on scales 0 to 1 and (4.4) holds. Then there exists $\beta > 0$ depending only on δ, C_R such that for all $\rho \in (0,1)$ and $h \in (0,1)$*

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)}\, A(h)\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})\to L^2(\mathbb{R})} \le C h^{\beta - 2(1-\rho)} \tag{4.5}$$

where the constant C depends only on $\delta, C_R, \{C_k\}, C_a, \rho$.

Proof. Denote by C constants which depend only on $\delta, C_R, \{C_k\}, C_a, \rho$ (the value of C may differ in different parts of the proof). We note that

$$\|A\|_{L^2\to L^2} \le C. \tag{4.6}$$

To see this, we compute the integral kernel of A^*A:

$$\mathcal{K}_{A^*A}(\xi,\eta) = h^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i x(\eta-\xi)/h} \overline{a(x,\xi)} a(x,\eta)\, dx.$$

Using (4.4) and repeated integration by parts in x we obtain

$$|\mathcal{K}_{A^*A}(\xi,\eta)| \le C h^{-1} \Big\langle \frac{\xi-\eta}{h} \Big\rangle^{-10}$$

which by Schur's inequality (see for instance [Zw12, Theorem 4.21]) gives $\|A^*A\|_{L^2\to L^2} \le C$ and thus (4.6) holds.

Take intervals I_X, I_Y such that $\operatorname{supp} a \subset I_X \times I_Y$ and $|I_X|, |I_Y| \le C_a$. We write

$$\mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)}\, A\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)} = \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)\cap I_X}\, A\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap I_Y} = \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)\cap I_X}\, \mathcal{F}_h^* A_1 + A_2 \mathcal{F}_h A\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap I_Y},$$
$$A_1 := \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus(Y(2h^\rho)\cap I_Y(1))}\, \mathcal{F}_h A\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap I_Y}, \quad A_2 := \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)\cap I_X}\, \mathcal{F}_h^*\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(2h^\rho)\cap I_Y(1)},$$

so that by (4.6)

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)}\, A\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)} \|_{L^2\to L^2} \le \|A_1\|_{L^2\to L^2} + C\|A_2\|_{L^2\to L^2}. \tag{4.7}$$

We have

$$\|A_1\|_{L^2\to L^2} \le C h^{10}. \tag{4.8}$$

Indeed, the integral kernel of A_1 is

$$\mathcal{K}_{A_1}(\xi,\eta) = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus(Y(2h^\rho)\cap I_Y(1))}(\xi)\mathbf{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap I_Y}(\eta)\cdot h^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i x(\eta-\xi)/h}a(x,\eta)\,dx.$$

Note that $|\xi-\eta|\geq h^\rho$ on $\operatorname{supp}\mathcal{K}_{A_1}$. Using (4.4) and repeated integration by parts in x, we obtain for each $M\in\mathbb{N}_0$

$$|\mathcal{K}_{A_1}(\xi,\eta)|\leq C_M h^{-1}\Big\langle\frac{\xi-\eta}{h}\Big\rangle^{-M-1}$$

which implies (4.8) by another application of Schur's inequality as soon as $M\geq\frac{10}{1-\rho}$.

We now estimate $\|A_2\|$. By Proposition 4.1 there exists $\beta>0$ depending only on δ, C_R such that

$$\|\,\mathbb{1}_{X(h)\cap I_X(1)}\,\mathcal{F}_h^*\,\mathbb{1}_{Y(h)\cap I_Y(2)}\,\|_{L^2\to L^2}\leq Ch^\beta.$$

We cover $X(h^\rho)\cap I_X$, $Y(2h^\rho)\cap I_Y(1)$ as follows:

$$X(h^\rho)\cap I_X\subset\bigcup_{\substack{p\in h\mathbb{Z}\\ |p|\leq h^\rho}}\big(X(h)\cap I_X(1)\big)+p,\quad Y(2h^\rho)\cap I_Y(1)\subset\bigcup_{\substack{q\in h\mathbb{Z}\\ |q|\leq 2h^\rho}}\big(Y(h)\cap I_Y(2)\big)+q.$$

Each of the above unions has at most $10h^{\rho-1}$ elements, therefore by (2.7) and the triangle inequality (2.8) we get

$$\|A_2\|_{L^2\to L^2}\leq Ch^{\beta-2(1-\rho)}. \tag{4.9}$$

Combining (4.7)–(4.9), we obtain (4.5). □

4.2. **Uncertainty principle with general phase.** We next prove a fractal uncertainty principle for operators $B=B(h):L^2(\mathbb{R})\to L^2(\mathbb{R})$ of the form

$$Bf(x)=h^{-1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\Phi(x,y)/h}b(x,y)\,f(y)\,dy \tag{4.10}$$

where for some open set $U\subset\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$\Phi\in C^\infty(U;\mathbb{R}),\quad b\in C_0^\infty(U),\quad \partial^2_{xy}\Phi\neq 0\quad\text{on } U. \tag{4.11}$$

Proposition 4.3. *Let $0\leq\delta<1$, $C_R\geq 1$ and assume that $X,Y\subset\mathbb{R}$ are δ-regular with constant C_R on scales 0 to 1 and (4.11) holds. Then there exist $\beta>0$, $\rho\in(0,1)$ depending only on δ, C_R and $C>0$ depending only on δ, C_R, Φ, b such that for all $h\in(0,1)$*

$$\|\,\mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)}\,B(h)\,\mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)}\,\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})\to L^2(\mathbb{R})}\leq Ch^\beta. \tag{4.12}$$

We first remark that it is enough to prove Proposition 4.3 under the assumption

$$1\ <\ |\partial^2_{xy}\Phi|\ <\ 2\quad\text{on } U. \tag{4.13}$$

Indeed, assume that Proposition 4.3 is established for all Φ satisfying (4.13). Then it also holds for all $\lambda_\Phi>0$ and Φ satisfying

$$\lambda_\Phi\ <\ |\partial^2_{xy}\Phi|\ <\ 2\lambda_\Phi\quad\text{on } U \tag{4.14}$$

where β, ρ do not depend on λ_Φ but C does. Indeed, put $\widetilde\Phi := \lambda_\Phi^{-1}\Phi$, then $\widetilde\Phi$ satisfies (4.13). If $\widetilde B(h)$ is given by (4.10) with Φ replaced by $\widetilde\Phi$, then $B(h) = \widetilde B(\lambda_\Phi^{-1}h)$, thus by slightly increasing ρ we see that Proposition 4.3 for $\widetilde\Phi$ implies it for Φ. Finally, for the case of general Φ we use a partition of unity for b and shrink U accordingly to split B into the sum of finitely many operators of the form (4.10) each of which has a phase function satisfying (4.14) for some λ_Φ.

The proof of Proposition 4.3 relies on the following statement which fattens the set X by $h^{\rho/2}$, intersects $Y(h^\rho)$ with a size $h^{1/2}$ interval, and is proved by making a change of variables and taking the semiclassical parameter $\tilde h := h^{1/2}$ in Proposition 4.2:

Lemma 4.4. *Assume (4.13) holds. Then there exist $\beta > 0$, $\rho \in (0,1)$ depending only on δ, C_R and $C > 0$ depending only on δ, C_R, Φ, b such that for all $h \in (0,1)$ and all intervals J of size $h^{1/2}$*

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X(h^{\rho/2})}\, B(h)\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap J} \|_{L^2\to L^2} \le Ch^\beta. \tag{4.15}$$

Proof. Fix $\rho \in (\frac12, 1)$ to be chosen later. Breaking the symbol b into pieces using a partition of unity, we may assume that

$$\operatorname{supp} b \;\subset\; I_X \times I_Y' \;\subset\; I_X \times I_Y \;\subset\; U$$

where I_X, I_Y, I_Y' are some intervals with $I_Y' \Subset I_Y$. We may assume that $J \subset I_Y$; indeed, otherwise the operator in (4.15) is equal to 0 for h small enough. Let y_0 be the center of J and define the function

$$\varphi : I_X \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\partial_y\Phi(x, y_0).$$

By (4.13) we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \;<\; |\partial_x\varphi| \;<\; \frac{1}{\pi} \quad \text{on } I_X. \tag{4.16}$$

In particular, $\varphi : I_X \to \varphi(I_X)$ is a diffeomorphism. We extend φ to a diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}$ such that (4.16) holds on the entire $\mathbb{R}$. Let $\Psi \in C^\infty(I_X \times I_Y)$ be the remainder in Taylor's formula for Φ, defined by

$$\Phi(x,y) = \Phi(x,y_0) + 2\pi(y-y_0)\varphi(x) + (y-y_0)^2\Psi(x,y), \quad x \in I_X,\ y \in I_Y.$$

Consider the isometries $W_X, W_Y : L^2(\mathbb{R}) \to L^2(\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$W_X f(x) = e^{-i\Phi(\varphi^{-1}(x),y_0)/h}\big|\partial_x(\varphi^{-1})(x)\big|^{1/2} f(\varphi^{-1}(x)), \quad W_Y f(y) = h^{-1/4} f\Big(\frac{y-y_0}{h^{1/2}}\Big).$$

Here we extend $\Phi(\varphi^{-1}(x), y_0)$ from $\varphi(I_X)$ to a real-valued function on $\mathbb{R}$. We also fix a function $\chi \in C_0^\infty((-1,1);[0,1])$ such that $\chi = 1$ near $[-\frac12, \frac12]$ and define the cutoff χ_J by

$$\chi_J(y) = \chi\Big(\frac{y-y_0}{h^{1/2}}\Big), \quad \chi_J = 1 \quad \text{on } J.$$

Put $A = A(h) := W_X B(h) \chi_J W_Y$, then we write A in the form (4.3):

$$Af(x) = \tilde{h}^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{2\pi i x\xi/\tilde{h}} a(x,\xi;\tilde{h}) f(\xi)\, d\xi$$

where $\tilde{h} := h^{1/2}$ and

$$a(x,\xi;\tilde{h}) = e^{i\xi^2 \Psi(\varphi^{-1}(x), y_0 + \tilde{h}\xi)} \big|\partial_x(\varphi^{-1})(x)\big|^{1/2} b(\varphi^{-1}(x), y_0 + \tilde{h}\xi)\chi(\xi).$$

The amplitude a satisfies (4.4) with the constants C_k, C_a depending only on Φ, b. We now have

$$\begin{aligned} \| \mathbb{1}_{X(h^{\rho/2})}\, B\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap J} \|_{L^2\to L^2} &\le \|W_X\, \mathbb{1}_{X(h^{\rho/2})}\, B\chi_J\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)}\, W_Y\|_{L^2\to L^2} \\ &\le \| \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{X}(C_\Phi \tilde{h}^\rho)}\, A\, \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{Y}(\tilde{h}^{2\rho-1})} \|_{L^2\to L^2} \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

where $\widetilde{X} := \varphi(X)$, $\widetilde{Y} := h^{-1/2}(Y - y_0)$. By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.2 the set $\widetilde{X}$ is δ-regular with constant $\widetilde{C}_R := 8\pi^2 C_R$ on scales 0 to 1. By Lemma 2.1 the set $\widetilde{Y}$ has the same property. Applying Proposition 4.2 we obtain

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{X}(\tilde{h}^{2\rho-1})}\, A\, \mathbb{1}_{\widetilde{Y}(\tilde{h}^{2\rho-1})} \|_{L^2\to L^2} \le C\tilde{h}^{\tilde{\beta}-4(1-\rho)} = Ch^{\frac{\tilde{\beta}}{2}-2(1-\rho)}$$

where $\tilde{\beta} > 0$ depends only on δ, C_R and C depends only on $\delta, C_R, \Phi, b, \rho$. Fixing $\rho := 1 - \frac{1}{8}\tilde{\beta}$, taking h small enough so that $C_\Phi \tilde{h}^\rho \le \tilde{h}^{2\rho-1}$, and using (4.17), we obtain (4.15) with $\beta = \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{4}$. □

We now finish the proof of Proposition 4.3 using almost orthogonality similarly to [DZ16, §5.2]:

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Denote by C constants which depend only on δ, C_R, Φ, b. Since $\partial^2_{xy}\Phi \ne 0$ on U, after using a partition of unity for b and shrinking U we may assume that

$$|\partial_x\Phi(x,y) - \partial_x\Phi(x,y')| \ge C^{-1}|y - y'| \quad \text{for all } (x,y),(x,y') \in U. \tag{4.18}$$

Take $\beta > 0$, $\rho \in (0,1)$ defined in Lemma 4.4. By [DZ16, Lemma 3.3], there exists $\psi = \psi(x;h) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R};[0,1])$ such that for some global constants $C_{k,\psi}$

$$\psi = 1 \quad \text{on } X(h^\rho), \quad \operatorname{supp}\psi \subset X(h^{\rho/2}); \tag{4.19}$$

$$\sup|\partial_x^k \psi| \le C_{k,\psi} h^{-\rho k/2}. \tag{4.20}$$

Take the smallest interval I_Y such that $\operatorname{supp} b \subset \mathbb{R} \times I_Y$. Take a maximal set of $\frac{1}{2}h^{1/2}$-separated points

$$y_1, \dots, y_N \in Y(h^\rho) \cap I_Y, \quad N \le Ch^{-1/2}$$

and let J_n be the interval of size $h^{1/2}$ centered at y_n. Define the operators

$$B_n := \sqrt{\psi}\, B\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap J_n}, \quad n = 1, \dots, N.$$

Then by Lemma 4.4 we have uniformly in n,

$$\|B_n\|_{L^2\to L^2} \ \le\ \| \mathbb{1}_{X(h^{\rho/2})}\, B\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap J_n} \|_{L^2\to L^2} \ \le\ Ch^\beta. \tag{4.21}$$

On the other hand, $Y(h^\rho)\cap I_Y \subset \bigcup_n (Y(h^\rho)\cap J_n)$ and thus

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)}\, B\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)} \|_{L^2\to L^2} \ \le\ \big\| \sqrt{\psi}\, B\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap I_Y} \big\|_{L^2\to L^2} \ \le\ \Big\| \sum_{n=1}^N B_n \Big\|_{L^2\to L^2}. \tag{4.22}$$

We say that two points y_n, y_m are *close* if $|y_n - y_m| \le 10h^{1/2}$ and are *far* otherwise. Each point is close to at most 100 other points. The following estimates hold when y_n, y_m are far:

$$B_n B_m^* = 0, \tag{4.23}$$

$$\|B_n^* B_m\|_{L^2\to L^2} \le Ch^{10}. \tag{4.24}$$

Indeed, (4.23) follows immediately since $J_n \cap J_m = \emptyset$. To show (4.24), we compute the integral kernel of $B_n^* B_m$:

$$\mathcal{K}_{B_n^* B_m}(y,y') = \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap J_n}(y)\, \mathbb{1}_{Y(h^\rho)\cap J_m}(y') \cdot h^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\frac{i}{h}(\Phi(x,y')-\Phi(x,y))} \overline{b(x,y)} b(x,y') \psi(x)\, dx.$$

Since y_n, y_m are far, we have $|y - y'| \ge h^{1/2}$ on $\operatorname{supp} \mathcal{K}_{B_n^* B_m}$. We now repeatedly integrate by parts in x. Each integration produces a gain of $h^{1/2}$ due to (4.18) and a loss of $h^{-\rho/2}$ due to (4.20). Since $\rho < 1$, after finitely many steps we obtain (4.24). See the proof of [DZ16, Lemma 5.2] for details.

Now (4.21), (4.23), and (4.24) imply by Cotlar–Stein lemma

$$\Big\| \sum_{n=1}^N B_n \Big\|_{L^2\to L^2} \le Ch^\beta$$

which gives (4.12) because of (4.22). □

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 3.** We parametrize the circle by $\theta \in \mathbb{S}^1 := \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$. Let $\Lambda_\Gamma \subset \mathbb{S}^1$ be the limit set of Γ; we lift it to a 2π-periodic subset of $\mathbb{R}$, denoted by X.

The set $X \subset \mathbb{R}$ is δ-regular with some constant C_R on scales 0 to 1, where we can take as μ_X the Hausdorff measure of dimension δ or equivalently the lift of the Patterson–Sullivan measure – see for example [Su79, Theorem 7] and [Bo16, Lemma 14.13 and Theorem 14.14]. Here $\delta \in [0,1]$ is the exponent of convergence of Poincaré series of the group and $\delta < 1$ when $M = \Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^2$ is convex co-compact but not compact – see for instance [Bo16, §2.5.2] and [Be71, Theorem 2].

Let $\mathcal{B}_\chi(h)$ be the operator defined in (1.2). By partition of unity, we may assume that $\operatorname{supp}\chi$ lies in the product of two half-circles. Then for all $h \in (0,1)$, $\rho \in (0,1)$

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{\Lambda_\Gamma(h^\rho)}\, \mathcal{B}_\chi(h)\, \mathbb{1}_{\Lambda_\Gamma(h^\rho)} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)\to L^2(\mathbb{S}^1)} = \| \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)}\, B(h)\, \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})\to L^2(\mathbb{R})}$$

where $B = B(h)$ has the form (4.10):

$$Bf(\theta) = h^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\Phi(\theta,\theta')/h} b(\theta,\theta') f(\theta')\, d\theta'.$$

Here, denoting $U := \{(\theta,\theta') \mid \theta - \theta' \notin 2\pi\mathbb{Z}\}$, the function $b \in C_0^\infty(U)$ is a compactly supported lift of $(2\pi)^{-1/2}\chi$ and $\Phi \in C^\infty(U;\mathbb{R})$ is given by

$$\Phi(\theta,\theta') = \log 4 + 2\log\left|\sin\left(\frac{\theta-\theta'}{2}\right)\right|, \quad \theta,\theta' \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We have

$$\partial^2_{\theta\theta'}\Phi = \frac{1}{2\sin^2\left(\frac{\theta-\theta'}{2}\right)} \neq 0 \quad \text{on } U.$$

By Proposition 4.3 there exist $\beta > 0$ and $\rho \in (0,1)$ depending only on δ, C_R and $C > 0$ depending on δ, C_R, χ such that for all $h \in (0,1)$,

$$\| \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)}\, B(h)\, \mathbb{1}_{X(h^\rho)} \|_{L^2\to L^2} \leq Ch^\beta$$

which implies (1.3) and finishes the proof of Theorem 3.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Maciej Zworski for several helpful discussions about the spectral gap problem. JB is partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1301619. SD is grateful for the hospitality of the Institute for Advanced Study during his stay there in October 2016. This research was conducted during the period SD served as a Clay Research Fellow.

References

[AFR09] Alexandru Aleman, Nathan Feldman, and William Ross, *The Hardy space of a slit domain,* Birkhäuser, 2009.

[BWPSKZ13] Sonja Barkhofen, Tobias Weich, Alexander Potzuweit, Hans-Jürgen Stöckmann, Ulrich Kuhl, and Maciej Zworski, *Experimental observation of the spectral gap in microwave n-disk systems,* Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**(2013), 164102.

[Be71] Alan Beardon, *Inequalities for certain Fuchsian groups,* Acta Math. **127**(1971), 221–258.

[BM62] Arne Beurling and Paul Malliavin, *On Fourier transforms of measures with compact support,* Acta Math. **107**(1962), 291–309.

[Bo14] David Borthwick, *Distribution of resonances for hyperbolic surfaces,* Experimental Math. **23**(2014), 25–45.

[Bo16] David Borthwick, *Spectral theory of infinite-area hyperbolic surfaces,* second edition, Birkhäuser, 2016.

[BW16] David Borthwick and Tobias Weich, *Symmetry reduction of holomorphic iterated function schemes and factorization of Selberg zeta functions,* J. Spectr. Th. **6**(2016), 267–329.

[BGS11] Jean Bourgain, Alex Gamburd, and Peter Sarnak, *Generalization of Selberg's 3/16 theorem and affine sieve,* Acta Math. **207**(2011), 255–290.

[BGH10] Nicolas Burq, Colin Guillarmou, and Andrew Hassell, *Strichartz estimates without loss on manifolds with hyperbolic trapped geodesics,* Geom. Funct. Anal. **20**(2010), 627–656.

[Ch09] Hans Christianson, *Applications of cutoff resolvent estimates to the wave equation,* Math. Res. Lett. **16**(2009), 577–590.

[Co95] John Conway, *Functions of one complex variable II,* Springer, 1995.

[Da09] Kiril Datchev, *Local smoothing for scattering manifolds with hyperbolic trapped sets,* Comm. Math. Phys. **286**(2009), 837–850.

[Do98] Dmitry Dolgopyat, *On decay of correlations in Anosov flows,* Ann. Math. (2) **147**(1998), 357–390.

[Dy15] Semyon Dyatlov, *Improved fractal Weyl bounds for hyperbolic manifolds,* with an appendix with David Borthwick and Tobias Weich, preprint, arXiv:1512.00836.

[DJ16] Semyon Dyatlov and Long Jin, *Resonances for open quantum maps and a fractal uncertainty principle,* preprint, arXiv:1608.02238.

[DJ17] Semyon Dyatlov and Long Jin, *Improved fractal uncertainty principle: Dolgopyat's method revisited,* in preparation.

[DZ16] Semyon Dyatlov and Joshua Zahl, *Spectral gaps, additive energy, and a fractal uncertainty principle,* Geom. Funct. Anal. **26**(2016), 1011–1094.

[GR89] Pierre Gaspard and Stuart Rice, *Scattering from a classically chaotic repeller,* J. Chem. Phys. **90**(1989), 2225–2241.

[GN09] Colin Guillarmou and Frédéric Naud, *Wave decay on convex co-compact hyperbolic manifolds,* Comm. Math. Phys. **287**(2009), 489–511.

[HJ94] Victor Havin and Burglind Jöricke, *The uncertainty principle in harmonic analysis,* Springer, 1994.

[HV16] Peter Hintz and András Vasy, *The global non-linear stability of the Kerr–de Sitter family of black holes,* preprint, arXiv:1606.04014.

[Ik88] Mitsuru Ikawa, *Decay of solutions of the wave equation in the exterior of several convex bodies,* Ann. Inst. Fourier **38**(1988), 113–146.

[IM74] Kiyosi Itô and Henry McKean, *Diffusion processes and their sample paths,* Springer, 1974.

[JN12] Dmitry Jakobson and Frédéric Naud, *On the critical line of convex co-compact hyperbolic surfaces,* Geom. Funct. Anal. **22**(2012), 352–368.

[MOW14] Michael Magee, Hee Oh, and Dale Winter, *Expanding maps and continued fractions,* preprint, arXiv:1412.4284.

[MNH06] Javad Mashreghi, Fedor Nazarov, and Victor Havin, *Beurling–Malliavin multiplier theorem: the seventh proof,* St. Petersburg Math. J. **17**(2006), 699–744.

[Na05] Frédéric Naud, *Expanding maps on Cantor sets and analytic continuation of zeta functions,* Ann. de l'ENS (4) **38**(2005), 116–153.

[No11] Stéphane Nonnenmacher, *Spectral problems in open quantum chaos,* Nonlinearity **24**(2011), R123.

[NZ09a] Stéphane Nonnenmacher and Maciej Zworski, *Quantum decay rates in chaotic scattering,* Acta Math. **203**(2009), 149–233.

[NZ09b] Stéphane Nonnenmacher and Maciej Zworski, *Semiclassical resolvent estimates in chaotic scattering,* Appl. Math. Res. Express **1**(2009), 74–86.

[OW16] Hee Oh and Dale Winter, *Uniform exponential mixing and resonance free regions for convex cocompact congruence subgroups of* $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$*,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **29**(2016), 1069–1115.

[Pa76] Samuel James Patterson, *The limit set of a Fuchsian group,* Acta Math. **136**(1976), 241–273.

[PS10] Vesselin Petkov and Luchezar Stoyanov, *Analytic continuation of the resolvent of the Laplacian and the dynamical zeta function,* Anal. PDE **3**(2010), 427–489.

[Sa12] Peter Sarnak, *Notes on thin matrix groups,* preprint, arXiv:1212.3525.

[St11] Luchezar Stoyanov, *Spectra of Ruelle transfer operators for axiom A flows,* Nonlinearity **24**(2011), 1089–1120.

[Su79] Dennis Sullivan, *The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions,* Publ. Math. de l'IHES **50**(1979), 171–202.
[Zw12] Maciej Zworski, *Semiclassical analysis,* Graduate Studies in Mathematics **138**, AMS, 2012.
[Zw16] Maciej Zworski, *Mathematical study of scattering resonances,* preprint, arXiv:1609.03550v2.

E-mail address: bourgain@math.ias.edu

Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540

E-mail address: dyatlov@math.mit.edu

Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA 02139